

John Adams Library,



IN THE CUSTODY OF THE
BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY.



SHELF N^o

★ ★ ADAMS

223.4



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010





R E M A R K S

O N

Several very important PROPHECIES.

I N F I V E P A R T S.



REMARKS

OF

SEVERAL VERY IMPORTANT EXPERIMENTS

ON THE NATURE OF THE

PHILOSOPHY OF THE

PHILOSOPHY OF THE

PHILOSOPHY OF THE

REMARKS

O N

Several very important PROPHECIES.

I N F I V E P A R T S.

- I. Remarks on the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, Fifteenth, and Sixteenth Verses of the SEVENTH Chapter of ISAIAH, in Answer to Dr. W——MS's Critical Dissertation on the same, as approved and republished by the Authors of the Critical Review.
- II. A Dissertation on the Nature and Style of Prophe- tical Writings, shewing that abrupt Transitions from one Subject to another are frequently found therein. The same being intended to illustrate the foregoing Remarks.
- III. A Dissertation on Ifaiah vii. 8.
- IV. A Dissertation on Genesis xlix. 10.
- V. An Answer to some of the principal Arguments used by Dr. W——MS in Defence of his Critical Dissertation on Ifaiah vii. 13, 14, 15, 16, &c. in which the Opinions of the late Dr. Sykes and Dr. G. Benson, concerning Accommodations of Scrip- ture-Prophecy, are briefly considered.

(1st Edition printed in 1768)

T H E S E C O N D E D I T I O N .

By GRANVILLE SHARP.

L O N D O N :

Printed for B. WHITE, at HORACE'S-HEAD,
FLEET-STREET.

M.DCC.LXXV.

c

REMARKS

ON THE

Thirteenth, Fourteenth, Fifteenth, and Sixteenth Verses,

OF THE

SEVENTH CHAPTER of ISAIAH.

IN ANSWER TO

Dr. W——ms's Critical Dissertation on the same,

As approved and *republished* by

The AUTHORS of the CRITICAL REVIEW.

PART I.

This second edition having been printed during the absence of the author, several transpositions and mistakes have unluckily been made in the *Hebrew* and *Syriac* quotations, which the reader is requested to correct in the following pages, *viz.*

P. 23. l. 7. for קע r. קץ

P. 33. l. 6. r. ואשור הוא מלכו

P. 64. l. 18. r. חרה וילדה

P. 85. l. 13 n. r. ואת דוד מלכ

P. 86. l. 7. r. את יהוה צבאות אתו תקדשו

Correct also the reference to this in the following page, *viz.* for *Isaiah* 13-16, r. *Isaiah* viii. 13-16.

P. 87. n (12). l. 4. r. לא יחיש

P. 94. l. 13. r.

עוד אחת מעט היא ואני מרעיש את השמים

P. 96. n. (15). l. 6. r. והיה אם שמוע תשמעון

P. 103. l. 19. r.

כי נער ישראל ואהבהו וממצרים קראתי לבני

P. 104. l. 7. r. קראו להם כן הלכו מפניהם לבעלים

יובחו ולפסלים יקטרון

P. 107. n. (19). l. 6. r. ואל

P. 116. l. 1. r. ומתחתיו יצמח

l. 7. for צמח r. צמה

P. 118. l. 2. r. אצמיח לדוד צמח צדקה

P. 119. l. 5. r. גזיר

P. 252. l. 7. r. עלמה

R E M A R K S

O N T H E

Thirteenth, Fourteenth, Fifteenth, and
Sixteenth Verses of the Seventh Chap-
ter of ISAIAH, &c.

“ Hear ye now, O house of David, is it a small thing
“ for you to weary men, but will you weary my
“ God also? Therefore the Lord himself shall give
“ you a sign: Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and
“ bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.
“ Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know
“ to refuse the evil and choose the good. For, be-
“ fore the child shall know to refuse the evil and
“ choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest
“ shall be forsaken of both her kings.”

T H I S text has in all ages of
Christianity been esteemed a
clear and certain prediction of
the miraculous birth of Christ; and there-
fore these remarks upon it would have
been superfluous, had not a learned and
ingenious

ingenious gentleman lately attempted to prove a contrary doctrine (1); viz. "*That the Prophet (in this text) had no reference to the Messiah (2).*" That "*the words of Isaiah prove only that a young woman should conceive and bring forth a son, without intimating any thing miraculous in her conception,*" &c. (3) That "*from the most careful and impartial examination, the word עַלְמָה (here translated a virgin) doth not appear to signify strictly a virgin;*" but that "*it seems to mean a young woman in general, without specifying particularly whether she is a virgin or not (4).*"

This writer is not singular in his notions, for the authors of the Critical Review have publicly professed themselves of the same opinion concerning this prophecy (see No. 136, fo. 349.)—"The
" *most*

(1) See Critical Dissertation on Isaiah vii. 13, 14, 15, 16.

(2) Page 44.

(3) P. 21.

(4) P. 23.

“ *most obvious and natural explication* (say
 “ *they*) *is this which Dr. W——ms* (5)
 “ *has adopted,*” &c.

I do not find that they have objected to a single part of the Doctor's work ; and therefore this public declaration certainly makes them parties to the whole : nay, perhaps I may say with justice, that they are more concerned in publishing these notions to the world, even than the *anonymous author* himself ; for, instead of giving a short extracted account of the work as usual, they seem to have copied the whole, almost at length, scarcely omitting a single circumstance.

Now I must acknowledge, in justice to Dr. W——ms, that I think he has set forth his hypothesis to all the advantage that it is capable of ; nevertheless, he does not make it appear that the word עולם

B

in

(5) The author of a Concordance to the Greek Testament.

in any other place of the Old Testament where it occurs, must *necessarily* signify a young woman that was *not* a virgin; without which proof the common acceptance of the sign promised by Isaiah cannot with justice be rejected; especially as a virgin did afterwards conceive and bear a son; a miracle which never happened before or since the birth of Christ! therefore it was certainly a sign worthy of that great and wonderful event; and, from that time to this, has by all Christians (except the author of the Critical Dissertation and the authors of the Critical Review) (6) been esteemed the completion of the said prophecy.

Dr.

(6) Dr. W——ms has since informed me of *one other* writer of the same opinion concerning this passage; (viz. the author of "*The Assembly's Confession of Faith examined*," printed in 1651;) but at the same time he acknowledges that this authority was not known, even to himself, until "*several months after the Dissertation was published*:" and he declares, concerning his own sentiments of the passage, that he apprehended them "*altogether new*" when he wrote; "*for (says he) I did not then know that any Christian writer had so explained it.*"

Dr. W——ms observes that the word עלמ occurs only seven times in all; and therefore, I hope, it will not take up too much of my readers time, if I attempt to examine the context of these several places, in order to ascertain the true sense of the word.

The text, wherein the signification of this word is esteemed the most doubtful, is in Prov. xxx. 19. where Solomon mentions four things that were too hard for him; in which number (according to the English translation) he includes "*the way of a man with a maid.*" The sense of this passage is very different according to the Syriac version, wherein עלמ is rendered ܐܕܡܐ ܕܢܝܢܐ in his youth, viz. the way of a man "*in his youth,*" and not "*with a maid,*" as in the English version. Likewise the Latin vulgate, as well as the old Latin version of St. Jerome, conforms in some degree to the

Syriac, though not intirely; for they construe it, *in adolescentia*, (not, in *adolescentia ejus*,) which is sufficiently clear without having recourse to Dr. Kennicott's (7) expedient of supposing a corruption in the present Heb. text to enable him to read "*in his youth*;" as if it had been written originally **בְּעַלְמִי**.

Nevertheless, it appears to me that the common English translation of this passage is to be preferred, and that the word must here necessarily signify a *maid* or *virgin*: for the writer seems to allude to the secret artifices and allurements used by a man in order to seduce a virgin; such *artifices* as are hinted at in Exodus xxii. 16. (—"And if a man *entice* a *maid*," **בְּתוּלָה** &c.) therefore a word signifying merely a young woman, or one that was not esteemed a virgin, would not have been so suitable to the context
of

(7) See his sermon preached before the university of Oxford in 1765.—Note 8, page 46.

of either of these passages. The *way* of a harlot was too well known in former days (as well as the present) to be esteemed a mystery; and much less a mystery to Solomon, who had “threescore queens, *four-score concubines*, and virgins without number.” (See Canticles vi. 8.) But it is not at all unnatural to suppose that this eastern monarch, with all his wisdom, might sometimes be perplexed with doubts and jealousies concerning the virtue and private conduct of some of those females (as well virgins as others) with respect to other men: this, it seems, was by him esteemed as difficult to be traced as the way of a ship in the sea, an eagle in the air, &c. By the sin of the adulterous woman (to which the preceding similies allude as being equally uninvestigable) (8) Solomon represents the great difficulty

(8) *Such* is the way of an adulterous woman; she eateth and wipeth her mouth, and saith, I have done no wickedness. Prov. xxx. 20.

difficulty of detecting the inconstancy of any particular persons in the two former classes; I mean his queens and concubines; and he would not find it less difficult (for some time at least) to trace out the *way* (or behaviour) of private admirers towards the third class of his women, that were esteemed *virgins* in the eyes of the world.

In confirmation of this I must observe, that the strictness of the law of Moses rendered the observance of secrecy absolutely necessary to offenders in this way: for, if a man was found guilty of *seducing a virgin*, (see Exodus xxii. 16.) he was obliged not only to pay a heavy fine to the young woman's father, and to take her for his wife, but was likewise deprived of an indulgence, which, of all others, seemed most agreeable to the libidinous disposition of the Jews at that time; and was allowed them by Moses
only

only on account of *the hardness of their hearts*; (see Matthew xix. 8.) I mean the *giving a bill of divorce*; for, in this case, (when a man was obliged to marry one whom he had seduced,) he might *not put her away all his days*. (See Deut. xxii. 28.) —A punishment of greater mortification to the Jews than any other, which the learned Philo (though himself a Jew) candidly acknowledges (9).

This certainly was a sufficient cause for secrecy on the man's part; so that, whether *his way* (or behaviour) *with a maid* were really criminal, or only imprudent, (for either of them may be implied in the text,) he would, as much as possible, conceal it from the world, and render it as *uninvestigable* as the other things mentioned in the text to be too wonderful for Solomon; at least his best endeavours

(9) Καὶ τὸ πάντων ἐκείνοις ἀνδρατόν, τὴν τῶν γαμῶν βιβάζουσιν, ἐὰν ὑπομένωσιν αἱ γυναῖκες αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ στυγαίῃν.
Fol. 789. Paris Edition, 1640.

endeavours would not be wanting to make it so.

Neither can we suppose that the same earnest endeavours would be wanting on the young woman's part to conceal her disgrace from her friends as long as she could. But the reasons for secrecy are far more obvious in the case of espoused virgins ; for, according to the law of Moses, (Deut. xxii. 23, 24.) if a man was base enough to seduce one of these, an ignominious death was to be the immediate and dreadful consequence of a discovery ; when both parties must share the same wretched fate (10).

Now, if all that I have said shall not be thought sufficient to prove that **עלמה** in this passage must necessarily signify a maid or virgin, I have nevertheless the satisfaction of observing that the author of the objections, in page 20, allows it to

(10) Deut. xxii. 23, 24.

to be “ *a very obscure passage ;*” and professes to “ *lay no stress upon it ;*” and, therefore, I think I may safely conclude, at least, that it is incapable of proving any thing against the true sense of the word in the other passages.

The same author observes, in page 19, that “ *other four places are absolutely uncertain ;*” but they appear in a very different light to me.

In the first of these places, (Genesis xxiv. 43.) the word is applied to Rebekah before her marriage, who in the same chapter is said expressly to be a *virgin*, (בחור) “ *neither had any man known her.*” (See 16th verse.)

In the second place (Exodus ii. 8.) it is applied to Moses's sister, who watched her infant brother during the time of his being exposed in the little ark of bulrushes.

C

Now

Now, it does not appear that Moses had any other sister besides Miriam the prophetess ; (see Numb. xxvi. 59. and Exodus xv. 20.) and why her chastity should be called in question (especially so early in life) I know not !

In the third place, (Psalm lxviii. 25.) this word with the context expresses the damsels playing with timbrels in the solemn processions of the sanctuary ; who, had they been damsels suspected of having "*wrought folly in Israel*," (Deut. xxii. 21.) (11) they, surely, would not have been permitted to join in this divine service.

The last of these four places, which the Doctor thinks "*absolutely uncertain*," is Canticles i. 3. where the same word is applied to the virgins that waited on Solomon's

(11) ——" that she die : because she *hath wrought folly in Israel*, to play the whore in her father's house : so shalt thou put evil away from among you."

lomon's spouse. But this uncertainty is easily removed by the other passage in Canticles, (chap. vi. ver. 8.) where the same word is happily applied to the same persons; who must be understood to be virgins, because (as Dr. W——ms himself acknowledges in page 29) (12) they “*are distinguished from queens and concubines.*”

This one would suppose to be an insurmountable obstacle to the Doctor's argument; but he passes very slightly over the difficulty, and contents himself with informing us, that “*this distinction is no proof at all, because the same, indeed a stronger, distinction is made, Ezek. xliv. 22. in favour of בְּתוּלָה.*”

C 2

Now,

(12) —“ I shall here add farther, that **עַלְמָה** occurs only seven times in all; one of which has the appearance of “*being decisive in the case, namely, Canticles vi. 8. where virgins are distinguished from queens and concubines.* But this distinction is no proof at all, because the same, indeed a stronger, distinction, is made, Ezek. xliv. 22. in favour of **בְּתוּלָה.**”

Now, I hope the Doctor will excuse my want of discernment in not being able to discover *the weight of this reason*, against so strong a proof as the distinction in question ; because, if **בתולה** is proved, ever so clearly, to signify strictly *a virgin*, (and indeed I know no reason why any person should doubt of it,) yet it is no argument why the other may not *likewise signify the same thing* ; for the word *maid*, by having this signification in English, does not oblige us to give a different signification to the English word *virgin* ; therefore, I think, I may safely conclude, in the Doctors's own words, that this last text "*has the appearance of being decisive in the case ;*" (see page 29.) and that the word **עלמה** cannot signify a young woman that is not a virgin, because, by the same word in the plural number, (according to the author's own observation,) "*virgins*"
 " are

“ are (13) distinguished from queens
“ and concubines.”

I propose now to examine whether we
may safely acquiesce with the author
of the Critical Dissertation, fo. 44. and
the authors of the Critical Review (N^o.
136,

(13) The ingenious author of the new translation of
Solomon's Song observes in his annotations, p. 69,
that “ the Jewish maidens before marriage were under
“ such strict confinement, and so rarely suffered to ap-
“ pear in public, that the very name for a virgin in
“ Hebrew is עלמה *hidden*.”

This word is well explained by the learned Stockius,
p. 820.

“ (1) *Generatim & vi originis notat latentem.*”

“ (2) *Speciatim (a) proprie notat virginem, quæ do-*
“ *mi latitat & continetur, nec adhuc cum quoquam*
“ *rem habuit. Ita dicitur de Rebecca, nondum*
“ *propalam nuptam educta, Gen. xxiv. de Mirjam,*
“ *quæ nondum rem cum quoquam habuerat, Ex. ii. 8.*
“ *de puella incorrupta & illibata, cui vir infidiatur,*
“ *ut ea potiatur, Prov. xxx. 19. de matre Immanuelis*
“ *illibata & concubitus ignara, Jes. vii. 14.*”

“ (3) *Metaphorice virginum nomine veniunt pii sa-*
“ *luandi, ad indicandum eorum animi integritatem &*
“ *puritatem, tam in doctrina & cultu divino, quam in*
“ *vita & moribus, Cant. i. 3. vi. 8,*” &c. Christiani
Stockii Clavis Linguae sanctae Veteris Testamenti vo-
cabulorum significationes tum *generales* tum *speciales* or-
dine concinno exhibens, &c.

136, fo. 359.) in their opinion, that
 Ifaiah, in his prophecy concerning Imma-
 nuel, in the seventh chapter, 13th, 14th,
 15th, and 16th verses, "*had no reference*
" to the Messiah."

Dr. W——ms objects (in page 9)
 that the 16th verse of the seventh chap-
 ter of Ifaiah "*cannot, in any sense, be*
" applied to the Messiah." The words of
 this text, according to the English tran-
 slation, are as follows: "For, before *the*
" child shall know to refuse the evil and
" choose the good, the land that thou
" abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her
" kings."

This verse seems to be the principal
 cause of his objections against the com-
 mon interpretation of the two preceding
 verses.

Now, though I do not think, with him,
 that these three verses *must, of necessity,*
relate

relate to the same person ; yet, I apprehend, there is a great probability that *they* may ; and that the 16th verse may reasonably be accounted for, even when applied to the Messiah. Dr. W——ms approves of the meaning given to the word *יָד* in the 16th verse by Mr. Mann, (viz. that it may signify “ *vexest*” instead of *abhorrest*,) “ the land which thou (Ahaz) “ *vexest* with thy idolatry.” (See fo. 34.) Thus far he favours the explication which I propose to give of this passage ; but then he supposes that *the land which Abaz vexed* signifies the land of Judah only. “ *The Prophet meant* to say, according to this author, (says the Doctor,) “ that the land of *Judah*, which Ahaz by “ his idolatry and wickedness had brought “ into trouble and difficulty, should be “ delivered from *both these kings* :” (fo. 35.) by which the Doctor refers to *Rezin* king of Syria, and *Pekah* the son of Remaliah king of Israel, who at that time were confederate

federate against *Judah*, and “*went up to-
wards Jerusalem to war against it.*” See
the first part of the same chapter.—The
Doctor repeats the same thing in page
37—viz.—the land (*of Judah*) which
thou (*Ahaz*) vexest, &c. This throws
great difficulty upon the text, which in-
forms us, that the land which *Ahaz* vex-
ed should “be forsaken of both *her kings.*”
The construction of the word, rendered
“*her kings,*” requires us to understand
that both the kings there spoken of should
be kings of that land which *Ahaz* vexed :
טני מלכיה “*both her kings.*”

Now, *Pekah king of Israel* cannot be un-
derstood to be one of these, if the land,
which *Ahaz* vexed, signified the land of
Judah alone ; for, in what sense could he
be called one of the kings of the *land of
Judah*, who was not a conqueror, (for the
true king still maintained his royal seat
and title,) but a declared enemy and dis-
turber, and *king only of Israel*?

Neither

Neither could Refin king of Syria be properly said to be either king of Judah or Israel; for he was only an invader of Judah, acting as an ally to the king of Israel.

Though indeed he had rather more right to be accounted one of *the kings of Judah* than the king of Israel had, because about that time he had taken possession of *Elath, a City of Judah*: but this could not really intitle him to be called a king of that land, because, from the time that the city was taken, it ceased to be a part of *Judah*, and was accounted a part of the *kingdom of Syria*; for it is expressly said in 2 Kings xvi. 6. that “*Refin king of Syria recovered Elath to Syria,*” “*and drave the Jews from Elath:*” and “*the Syrians came to Elath, and dwelt there unto this day.*” Dr. W——ms observes in a note (page 37.) that “*Refin*

D

“ and

“ and Pekah are, perhaps, here called
 “ the kings of Judah, because they were
 “ then in possession of all the country,
 “ Jerusalem excepted ;” but the Doctor
 surely did not consider, that Isaiah was
 sent to confirm Ahaz, that he should not
 fear “ *the two tails of these smoking fire-*
 “ *brands,*” (viz. Rezin and the son of Re-
 maliah,) and to assure him, that their evil
 council of *setting up a king in Judah*
should “ not stand ”—nor—“ *come to pass.*”
 It is not likely, therefore, that the pro-
 phet should call either or both of these
 kings *kings of Judah*, because it would
 have been absolutely a contradiction to
 his message, which was to encourage and
 establish *the then reigning king of Judah*,
 descended from the house of David.
 Even the Doctor himself seems so sensible
 of the insufficiency of his interpretation,
 that he afterwards, in the same note,
 proposes another expedient, (though a
 dangerous

dangerous (14) one,) in hopes of solving the difficulty ; for the text not being capable of serving his purpose as it stands at present, the prophet himself must be corrected.

This is esteemed a much easier thing, now-a-days, than for a critic to give up a favourite opinion, that happens to be contradictory to the Holy Scripture.

“ Suppose (says the Doctor) that we
 “ should read מלכיה for מלכיה *her*
 “ *kings? shall be forsaken of both kings*”
 —this indeed is cutting the knot, but it

D 2 will

(14) “ Thus it happens with these sacred books as
 “ with prophane authors, that, when the *medica manus*
 “ *criticorum* is to perform an operation upon the text,
 “ it is often dislocated and maimed, and rendered al-
 “ most incurable by improper applications. But, what-
 “ ever may be done with the historical books, we have
 “ no right to indulge any conjectural emendations in
 “ the prophecies : it looks too much like tampering
 “ with evidence. If they are faulty, they must even
 “ remain so ; and we must take the evidence as it
 “ comes to us.”

Dr. Gregory Sharpe's 2d Argument in Defence
 of Christianity, p. 265.

will not enable the Doctor to come off conqueror, like the Grecian hero. If the omission of the word *αυτης* in the Septuagint translation should even be allowed to afford sufficient grounds for such a supposition; yet "*Dr. Kennicott's truly important work*" is not likely to furnish various readings from MSS. equal in authority and antiquity with those from which Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion were taken. These were, manifestly, according to the present Heb. text in this passage; for it is rendered by all these translators, *των δυο βασιλεων αυτης*, of *her* two kings, or of both *her* kings.

The ancient Syriac version, likewise, confirms the text; *ܐܡܠܝܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ* *both her kings*. It would have been time enough to have quoted Dr. Kennicott's various reading, when it was known that any such subsisted—for it is not fair dealing to wound the credit of the holy text with
a mere

a mere "*perhaps*," (15) and for no other purpose (if I may use the Doctor's own words) than to "*strengthen a conjecture*." In short, I would advise the Doctor to let the text remain as he found it; for this unjustifiable method of solving difficulties is a broken reed, which seldom fails to wound the hands of those who use it.

Now the difficulty ceases, if it be admitted that the *land which Abaz vexed* signified the land or inheritance of the twelve tribes of Israel, including Judah; which construction the circumstances of those times will enable it to bear.

Ahaz had interrupted the sacrifices of atonement usually offered up for *all Israel* in the temple at Jerusalem, which was common to Jews and Israelites; and
therefore

(15) " Dr. Kennicott's truly important work may, "*perhaps*, hereafter *strengthen this conjecture*." In a note, fo. 37.

therefore might truly be said to *vex* the land of Israel as well as Judah : for he not only “ *sacrificed unto the gods of Damascus,*” (2 Chron. xxviii. 23.) but he “ cut in pieces the vessels of the house of God, and *shut up the doors of the house of the Lord*” (24th verse). King Hezekiah (16) (who opened again the doors of the house of the Lord, and caused the priests and Levites to cleanse all the house from the abominations of Ahaz) was conscious that his father, by the interruption of divine service before-mentioned, had *vexed Israel* as well as Judah ; and therefore made all the amends that lay in his power. He caused “ *an atonement*” to be made “ *for all Israel :*” for the king “ com-
manded that the burnt-offering and the
sin-offering should be *made for all Israel.*” 2 Chron. xxix. 24.

He

(16) See 2 Chron. xxix.

He likewise “ sent to *all Israel* and
 “ *Judah*, and wrote letters also to Ephra-
 “ *im* and *Manasseh*, that they should
 “ come to the house of the Lord at Je-
 “ *rusalem*, to keep the passover unto the
 “ *Lord God of Israel.*” 2 Chron. xxx. 1.
 And we read, in the 11th verse of the
 same chapter, that “ *divers of Asher* and
 “ *Manasseh*, and of *Zebulun*, humbled
 “ themselves (accordingly) and came
 “ to *Jerusalem* ;” and “ *did eat the pass-*
 “ *over.*” (See 18th verse.) Now, as it
 appears that the *land of all the other Tribes*,
 as well as the *land of Judah*, was real-
 ly vexed by the apostasy of Ahaz, there
 is reason to suppose that *the land of Im-*
manuel, mentioned by Isaiah (viii. 8.)
 might signify (not only *the land of Judah*,
 but) the land of *both the houses of Is-*
rael, שְׁנֵי בְּתֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, mentioned in the
 14th verse of the same chapter ; and that
 the *two kings* of the land, mentioned in
 the

the seventh chapter, may mean the kings, or *separate regal powers*, of these two houses of Israel, which were *both to cease before the child* (Immanuel) *should know to refuse the evil and choose the good*. The word מלך or king, in a figurative way of speaking, may very well be understood in some passages (not to mean merely the person of one particular king, but in a more general sense) to signify a *succession of kings*, or rather *the regal constitution of a state*; and the failure of such royalty in some cases serves as a distinguishing mark of conquest or subjection to a foreign power. “*The king shall perish from Gaza, and Ashkelon shall not be inhabited*,” says the prophet Zechariah, (ix. 5.) by which is plainly understood (not the destruction of a single king, but) the ceasing of the regal government of the city of Gaza. It is a synonymous term with the *departing of the sceptre*: “*The pride of Assyria shall*
“ be

“ be brought down, and *the sceptre of*
 “ *Egypt* shall depart away,” says the
 same prophet in the 11th verse of the
 succeeding chapter. The prophet Hosea,
 likewise, uses the word מֶלֶךְ in the same
 general sense (xi. 5.) מֶלְכֵּךְ וְאַשּׁוּר הוּא —
 “ the Assyrian (or Assur) shall be his
 “ king:” *one Assyrianking only* cannot here
 be meant; but the succession of kings
 reigning in Assyria during the captivity of
 Israel. Therefore, I presume, there is
 some ground for my supposition, that Isai-
 ah’s expression in the seventh chapter,
 שְׁנֵי מַלְכִּיָּה, may signify *the two separate*
regal governments of Judah and Israel,
 (called, in the twenty-third chapter of
 Ezechiel, Aholah and Aholibah,) and
 not merely two single kings.

When I first wrote this opinion, and
 communicated the MS. to Dr. W—ms, I
 apprehended that the thought was intirely
 new ;—so little am I acquainted with the

E

republic

republic of letters, for want of leisure and opportunity to read ! I must therefore acknowledge myself obliged to Dr. W—ms for his information, that the learned Mr. Mann, in his dissertation *De Anno natali Christi*, “ *appears to be of the same opinion.*” I had likewise the satisfaction, afterwards, to be informed by another gentleman, (a worthy friend of mine,) that the same interpretation is recommended in the *Universal History*, vol. IV. of the Octavo, p. 154, with the note K.

Now, that the opinion of the learned author may more clearly be understood, I will set down at length the whole that he wrote upon the text in question,

Having mentioned the subject of Isaiah’s message to Ahaz, he adds—“ Here
 “ the king, whether out of respect or des-
 “ pondency and unbelief,—refusing to ask
 “ the promised sign, the prophet assured
 “ him

“ him from the Lord, that—before that
 “ time came, a virgin should conceive
 “ and bear a son, and call his name Him-
 “ manuel, or God with us; and so on.”
 (K).

Upon this opinion he farther explains himself in the following note.

“ (K) This we take to be a much
 “ more natural sense of that prophecy,
 “ than to suppose, as some have done,
 “ that such a miraculous child was really
 “ born in Ahaz’s time, to assure him of
 “ the promised deliverance; for, as there
 “ is not the least mention of such an ex-
 “ traordinary birth, so neither do we see
 “ that there was any necessity for it, in
 “ order to convince the desponding king;
 “ who could not be ignorant of that pro-
 “ phecy of Jacob, that the sceptre should
 “ not depart from Judah till Shiloh
 “ was come, much less that he was to
 “ spring of the lineage of David. But

“ what staggered Ahaz’s faith, and made
 “ him fear that the regal power was go-
 “ ing to depart from his family, was,
 “ that his two enemies had combined to
 “ set a stranger on his throne. All,
 “ therefore, that was wanting to dispel
 “ his present fears about it, was for the
 “ prophet to assure him from God, that
 “ this Shiloh, promised to Judah and
 “ David, who was to fore-run the total
 “ excision of the Jewish polity, was to be
 “ born in a miraculous manner and with
 “ a divine character, and other remark-
 “ able circumstances, such as, he might
 “ be easily satisfied, had not as yet hap-
 “ pened in his kingdom.

“ As for that part of the prophecy
 “ which is commonly urged on the o-
 “ ther side, namely, “ *Before this won-*
 “ *derful child shall know good from evil,*
 “ *the land which thou abhorrest shall be*
 “ *forsaken of both her kings :*” We think
 “ that,

“ that, if it be rightly understood, it will
 “ rather confirm our sense of the prophe-
 “ cy, and that the words ought to be
 “ thus rendered. For (or rather, as the
 “ particle *chi* seems to import here, nay)
 “ before this child can know good from
 “ evil, this land, which thou (not ab-
 “ horrest, as our version renders it, but)
 “ art so solicitous about, or givest up for
 “ lost, shall be bereaved of both her
 “ kings ; by which, we think, ought to
 “ be understood, not the kings of Syria
 “ and Israel, for the former could not be
 “ called her (Canaan’s) king ; and the
 “ latter had but a share in it at best ; *but*
 “ *the kings of Israel and Judah*, as it real-
 “ ly was before the coming of the Mes-
 “ siah.”

In order to confirm this opinion, I
 have annexed to these remarks two dis-
 tinct dissertations : one on the prophecy
 of Isaiah vii. 8. (——“ and within
 “ threescore

“ threescore and five years shall Ephraim
 “ be broken that it be not a people”) ;
 and the other on the famous prophecy of
 Jacob, concerning the sceptre of Judah.

In the former I shew, that the *regal government* of the *house of Israel*, as a separate state from Judah, was put an end to, not a great many years after Isaiah’s prophecy.

In the latter (I hope) I have proved that the regal government of the house of Judah (I mean only the temporal or worldly kingdom of Judah) ceased precisely at the time limited by Isaiah in the prophecy now before us. So that, I flatter myself, it will appear, upon the whole, that the land of Israel, including Judah (being the land which Ahaz *vexed*) was forsaken of “ *both her kings,*” or regal governments, before the child Immanuel could “ *know to refuse the evil and choose* “ *the good.*”

For,

For, Herod the Great, on a careful examination, (I believe) will be found to have been the last king of *the whole land of Israel and Judah*, which Ahaz vexed ; and it is remarkable, that Christ, the true Immanuel, *was a young child in the arms of his mother* at the time of this monarch's death ; soon after which, Joseph, the husband of the blessed virgin, was warned by an angel of the Lord in Egypt, saying, “ Arise, and take THE YOUNG CHILD and his mother, and go into “ *the land of Israel,*” (not the land of *Judah* only,) “ for they are *dead* which “ fought the *young child's* life.” Mat. ii. 20.

But Dr W—ms in a note (page 32) observes, that the child Immanuel “ *could* “ *not be Christ, because he is never called* “ *the king of Judah.*” And he thinks that Nathaniel, when he called him *the king of Israel*, “ *laboured* under the same “ mistake with all his countrymen, who “ expected

“ expected a temporal Messiah.” The Doctor observes, in the same note, that “ *Christ is king of the whole earth ;*” which he seems to assign as a reason why “ *he is never called the king of Judah.*”

And indeed it does not appear that the Doctor had any other foundation for his censure of Nathaniel ; though this argument is so far from being conclusive in favour of the Doctor’s opinion, that it rather proves the contrary ; for he that is king of *the whole earth* must necessarily, in a general sense, be king of Israel and Judah ; these titles being most certainly included in the former, even supposing the peculiar sceptre of each kingdom to be departed.

Nevertheless, the argument (such as it is) is admitted and approved by the Critical Reviewers ! for they quote the Doctor’s words at length, (see N° 136, fo. 356.) without offering any thing to justify

fy Nathaniel from the charge of *labouring under a mistake.*

It shall therefore be my business to prove, that the mistake does *not rest with Nathaniel.*

Christ is, in a peculiar manner, eternal king of Judah and Israel, as well as king of the whole earth, and *heir of all things.* (Heb. i. 2.) The angel Gabriel testified that Christ should *reign over the house of Jacob (which is Israel)* for ever. See St. Luke i. 32. And the wise men of the East *went to Jerusalem* and inquired, “Where is he that is *born king of the Jews?* for we have seen his star in the East, and come” (that is, to Jerusalem, the capital of his kingdom) “to *worship him.*” See Matth. ii. 1, 2. Therefore the Doctor’s objection, that the child Immanuel could not be Christ *because he is never called the king of Judah,* seems to be intirely groundless; for, the

F

dominion

dominion of the land of Immanuel (mentioned in the eighth chapter of Isaiah) may most certainly be attributed with more propriety to the Messiah, who *was king and shepherd of Israel*, (see Ezek. xxxvii. 24. also xxxiv. 23, 24.) than to any son of Isaiah whatever.

Dr. W—ms may, perhaps, suppose, that the kingdoms of Israel and Judah could not belong to Christ, because he refused to accept of any temporal government, and withdrew himself when he perceived that the people would come, and take him by force to *make him a king*; (see John vi. 15.) and farther, because he even declared that his kingdom was not of this world. See chap. xviii. 36. But all this seems to relate only to the manner of his government, which, in general, was merely spiritual. He was nevertheless *king of Israel*, being sent in a particular manner to the lost sheep of the house

house of Israel ; (see Matth. xv. 24.) and, for a time, Jerusalem was *the seat of his kingdom*, when he went up to the feast ; and a very great multitude spread their garments in the way, (a greater mark of submission than is ever paid to temporal princes,) and others cut down branches from the trees, and strowed them in the way, (see Matth. xxi. 8.) and cried, *Hosanna, Blessed is the KING OF ISRAEL*, that cometh in the name of the Lord. John xii. 13.

Christ did not tell the multitude that they “ laboured *under a mistake*” in calling him KING OF ISRAEL ; on the contrary, it appears that he approved of the voice of the people ; which could not have been the case, had he not been really *king of Israel*: for, when the Pharisees said unto him, Master, rebuke thy disciples, he answered and said unto them, “ I tell you, that if these should *bold their*

“ *peace, the stones would immediately cry out.*” Luke xix. 38, 39, 40. Thus was the Messiah not only “ *called,*” but *proclaimed, king of Israel*; and as such he received the homage of his people; yet, in such a manner, as best suited the sacred character of him, who had *rejected a worldly kingdom*: for, instead of royal apparel and a triumphal car, he was “ *cloathed with humility,*” and sitting on an ass, that the prophecy of Zechariah might be literally fulfilled.

“ Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion;
 “ shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: be-
 “ hold, THY KING cometh unto thee:
 “ he is just, and having salvation, *lowly,*
 “ and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt
 “ the foal of an ass.” (Zech. ix. 9.)
 But, though Christ professed that his kingdom was not of this world, yet there was no worldly man hardy enough to resist or oppose his will, when he was pleased

pleased to exert his divine authority over them; for, “ he cast out them that sold
 “ and bought in the temple, and over-
 “ threw the tables of the money-changers,
 “ and the seats of them that sold doves;
 “ and *would not suffer* that any man should
 “ carry any vessel through the temple.”
 Mark xi. 15, 16.

And St. John informs us (chap. ii. 15.) that he made a scourge of small cords, and drove them all (all such as are above mentioned) out of the temple.

Of all the extraordinary things which Christ did, St. Jerome thought this to be the most wonderful, as Mr. Bragge remarks in his Practical Observations upon the Miracles. This personal authority and dominion of Christ *in Israel* was expressly foretold by the prophet Micah, (ch. v. 2.)
 “ But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though
 “ thou be little among the thousands of
 “ Judah, yet out of thee shall he come
 “ forth

“ forth unto me, that is to be RULER IN
 “ ISRAEL ; whose goings forth have been
 “ from of old (17) from everlasting.” I
 never read any passage of Scripture which
 was capable of affording the least counte-
 nance or support to the contrary doctrine,
 that *Christ was not the king of Israel*. In-
 deed, the enemies and persecutors of our
 Lord, at the time of his crucifixion, express-
 ed their disbelief of his being king of Isra-
 el (18), because they did not think him
 to be the true anointed, or Messiah. Ne-
 vertheless, when the several extraordinary
 and miraculous circumstances, relating to
 the birth, life, death, and persecution, of
 that most holy person (Jesus of Nazareth)
 are candidly examined and carefully com-
 pared

(17) “ In the beginning was the Word, and the
 “ Word was with God, and the Word was God. The
 “ same was in the beginning with God.” John i. 1.

(18) “ If he be *the king of Israel*, (said they,) let him
 “ now come down from the cross, and we will believe
 “ him.” Matth. xxvii. 42.

pared with the prophetical declarations concerning the promised Messiah, it manifestly appears, that there were very sufficient reasons for acknowledging that person to be both *Lord and Christ*. (19); and consequently "*king of Israel*," in the strictest sense, not only during his bodily residence on earth, but to all eternity.

Wherefore,

(19) "Therefore let all the *HOUSE of Israel* know assuredly, that God hath made *that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ*." Acts ii. 36.

"And the angel said unto them, (the shepherds,) Fear not: for, behold, I bring unto you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For, unto you is born this day, *in the city of David*, a saviour, *which is Christ the Lord*." Luke ii. 10, 11.

"The Word which God sent unto the *children of Israel*, preaching peace by *Jesus Christ, (he is Lord of all)*." Acts x. 36.

"—But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, (even) the hidden (wisdom) which God ordained before the world unto our glory. Which none of the princes of this world knew; for had they known (it) they would not have crucified the *Lord of glory*." 1 Corinth. ii. 7. 8.

"—That every tongue should confess that *Jesus Christ is Lord*, to the glory of God the father." Philip. ii. 11.

Wherefore, we ought most certainly to acquit Nathaniel, and other faithful Israelites, of the *mistake* which they have lately been supposed to “*labour under*,” when they declared our Lord Jesus Christ to be “*the king of Israel*.” (John i. 49. xii. 13.)

Thus far have I ventured to suggest, in answer to Dr. W——ms’s declaration in page 9,——that “the 16th verse” (of the seventh chap. of Isaiah) “*can not in any sense be applied to the Messiah*.” I hope I have proved that it may; nevertheless I must observe, that even the common interpretation of this passage is not so unreasonable as Dr. W——ms seems to imagine; though, indeed, the interpretation before given appears to be much less liable to exception.

The Doctor animadverts very severely on the opinion of those, who say, that the passage contains two distinct prophecies;

cies ;—viz. that the verses 14 and 15 relate to Christ, but the 16th to Isaiah's son. “ *Is not this* (says he) *very unnatural? and, if I am not mistaken, very unusual?*”

But the authors of the old commentary on the Bible, commonly called *Assemblies Annotations*, were of a very different opinion.

They observe, on this very text, that “ *it is an usual thing* in Scripture, with “ our prophet Isaiah especially, by way “ of allusion, to apply the same words “ and phrases unto divers subjects, where “ occasion is to speak of them together :” and therefore they were of opinion, that the child mentioned in the 16th verse was “ no other, in all likelihood, than “ Shearjashub, the prophet's child, “ whom, to this purpose, God hath “ commanded him to take along with
G “ him.”

“ him.” How far this was an usual thing with Isaiah, may be seen even in prophecies which were delivered on the same occasion as the text in question.

For the farther illustration of this point, I have added to my book a short dissertation on the nature and style of prophetic writings, shewing, that abrupt transitions from one subject to another are frequently found therein ; and that the Holy Scriptures afford many examples of prophecies, which are blended and interwoven with other subjects that are intirely different, both as to the matter and the time of accomplishment.

We must not expect to find all prophecies unattended with difficulties : nevertheless, there are no difficulties in the seventh chapter of Isaiah so great as those, that are occasioned by Dr. W——m’s interpretation of it. “ This prophecy” (says he,)

he,) “ as I take it, relates to *one person*
 “ *only*, and that *was the son of a young*
 “ *woman then present* ; which son was af-
 “ *terwards to be born.*” See page 4.

Now I may ask, with Origen, (20)
 contra Celsum, pag. 28, Cambridge edi-
 tion, 1677,) — “ Who was born in the
 “ time of Ahaz, of whose birth this is
 “ said,— Emanuel? *that is*, GOD WITH
 “ us. For, if no one is found, it is ma-
 “ nifest, that what was said of Ahaz
 “ was addressed to *the house of DAVID*,
 “ according to that which is written : —
 “ *viz.—of the seed of David a Saviour is*
 “ *born according to the flesh.*”

Indeed, we read, in the eighth chap-
 ter, of a son, which the prophets con-

G 2

ceived

(20) “ Απαιτησομεν κατα της χρονης τῆς Αχαζ τις ἐγεννησεν,
 “ ἐφ’ ᾧ τῇ γενεσῇ λεγεται το, Εμμανηλ, ὃ ἐστὶ Μεθ’ ἡμῶν ὁ
 “ Θεος ; εἰ γὰρ υἱεὶς εὐρεθησεται, δηλον ὅτι το τῷ Αχαζ εἰρη-
 “ μενον, τῷ οἴκῳ εἰρηται Δαβιδ, δια το ἐκ σπερματος Δαβιδ
 “ ἀναγεσθαι τον Σωτηρα γεγονεναι το κατα σαρκα.”

ceived and bare unto Ifaiah ; and likewise, that Ifaiah was careful to take unto him FAITHFUL WITNESSES TO RECORD concerning him : “ For, (said he,) before the child shall have knowledge to cry, My father and my mother, (which must be within two years,) the RICHES of DAMASCUS and the SPOIL of SAMARIA shall be taken away before the king of Assyria.” Therefore, this child was certainly the TEMPORARY SIGN of the promised deliverance from the *two powers* of DAMASCUS and SAMARIA : but, unfortunately for Dr. W——ms’s hypothesis, the said child was NOT CALLED IMMANUEL, but MAHER-SHALAL-HASH-BAZ ; מַהֲרֵשֶׁלַח שָׁלַל בֹּז properly signifying and prefiguring the *near approach of the spoiling of Damascus and Samaria*. Now, we do not read of any other child, born at that time as a sign ; and therefore Dr. W——ms’s opinion, concerning Immanuel, is not
only

only a *mere supposition*, but a very improbable one; since it is not at all likely that TWO CHILDREN were then born, one *Maher-schalal-hash-baz*, and the other *Immanuel*, and both of them intended as MERE TEMPORARY SIGNS OF THE SAME THING.

The Doctor will find, on a farther examination of the text, that the birth of Isaiah's son is only an *allusion*, or *imperfect imitation*, of the former REMOTE SIGN, mentioned in the seventh chapter, (*viz.* of Immanuel's birth,) in the same manner as the *brazen serpent* (21), *lifted up*

(21) “ And the Lord said unto Moses, Make thee
 “ a fiery serpent, and set it upon a pole; and it shall
 “ come to pass, that every one that is bitten, when
 “ he looketh upon it, shall live. And Moses made a
 “ serpent of brass, and put it upon a pole; and it came
 “ to pass, that if a serpent had bitten any man, when
 “ he beheld the *serpent of brass*, he lived.” Numb.
 xxi. 8, 9. — “ And as Moses lifted up THE SERPENT
 “ in the wilderness, even so must THE SON OF MAN
 “ BE LIFTED UP; that whosoever believeth in him
 “ SHOULD NOT PERISH, but have eternal life.” John
 iii.

up in the wilderness, was an imperfect imitation, or type, of Christ crucified ; and that the TEMPORARY DELIVERANCE from the *two kings* (of which the birth of Isaiah's son was the TEMPORARY SIGN) cannot rightly be considered as the accomplishment of the prophecy, but rather as a *confirmation* and *sure pledge* of the said REMOTE SIGN, as I have before observed.

“ *But, when the FULNESS OF TIME*
 “ *was come,*” the angel Gabriel was sent from God to Nazareth, with a FARTHER REVELATION of the then approaching SIGN of the redemption promised by Isaiah.

The *blessed virgin* answered, (Luke i. 34.) “ *How shall this be, seeing I know*
 “ *not a man?*”

That

iii. 14, 15. — See Mr. Cruden's excellent remarks on these texts, under the word SERPENT, in his Concordance.

That “ *a woman should compass a man*”
(*viz.* conceive and bear a son without the knowledge of man) was an event scarcely to be expected or comprehended by man ; it being the *new thing* which God had created in the earth, spoken of by the prophet Jeremiah xxxi. 22. (22) So that it was plainly the *seed of the woman* which bruised the serpent’s head, as promised in Genesis iii. 15. (23).

The occasion of Isaiah’s prophecy, concerning the miraculous birth of Immanuel, is mentioned in the beginning of the seventh chapter. — “ Because Syria,
“ Ephraim, and the son of Remaliah,
“ have

(22) “ How long wilt thou go about, O thou back-
“ sliding daughter? (the virgin of Israel): for the
“ Lord hath created A NEW THING in the EARTH, a
“ WOMAN shall COMPASS A MAN.” Jerem. xxxi. 22.

(23) “ And I will put enmity between thee and the
“ woman, and between thy seed and HER SEED: IT
“ SHALL BRUISE THY HEAD, and thou shalt bruise
“ his heel.” Gen. iii. 15.

“ have taken evil counsel against thee,
 “ (Ahaz,) saying, Let us go up against
 “ Judah, and vex it; and let us make a
 “ breach therein for us, and *set* A KING
 “ IN THE MIDST OF IT, even the son
 “ of Tabeal.” But “ thus saith the Lord
 “ God, *It shall not stand, neither shall it*
 “ *come to pass.*”

Now, this was a confirmation of the
 promise made by God to David, and de-
 livered by Nathan the prophet, (2 Sam.
 vii. 16.) viz. “ *Thine house and thy king-*
 “ *dom shall be established for ever before*
 “ *thee: THY THRONE shall be establish-*
 “ *ed for EVER.*”

Therefore, as Justin Martyr observes
 (24), if the prophecy, “ *Behold, a vir-*
 “ *gin*

(24) Καὶ γὰρ εἶπεν, ὦ Τρυφῶν, εἰ μὲν καὶ τὴν προφητείαν,
 ἥτις εἶπεν Ἡσαίας, εἰρήσεται πρὸς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Δαβὶδ, Ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος
 ἐν γαστρὶ λήψεται, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἕτερον οἶκον τῶν δωδεκάφυλων,
 ἴσως ἀνὰ ἀπορίαν εἶχε τὸ πρᾶγμα· ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ αὕτη ἡ προφη-
 τεῖα πρὸς τὸν οἶκον Δαβὶδ εἰρήσεται, τὸ εἰρημένον πρὸς Δαβὶδ ὑπὸ
 Θεοῦ ἐν μυστηρίῳ, διὰ Ἡσαίου ὡς ἐμελλε γίνεσθαι ἐξηγήσῃ. Jus-
 tini Dialogus cum Tryphone Judæo, pag. 293, Paris
 Edition, 1636.

“ *gin shall conceive,*” had not been spoken to the house of David, but to any other house of the twelve tribes, the affair might have been doubtful; but the sign was really given to the HOUSE OF DAVID; (see 13th verse — “Hear ye now, O house of David;”) and, as no man was *ever born of a virgin* except the MESSIAH, who, on account of this birth, was called the SON OF DAVID, therefore it was surely the properest sign that could be given, to assure them that the *house* and the KINGDOM of DAVID *should be established for ever*, and that the evil counsel of Syria and Ephraim should not stand. The house and the kingdom of David cannot be established FOR EVER, in the person of any of David’s descendants, except the Messiah himself; for (with respect to the present times) the worldly kingdom of David ceased very many ages ago, and his people, the children of Israel, being most

H

deservedly

deservedly ejected (on account of their wickedness and unbelief) from their old inheritance, the land of Canaan, have never since obtained any other as a possession, but, for near seventeen hundred years, have been dispersed throughout the whole world: and yet, by the manifest providence (25) of God, they remain, to this day, in the *midst of all nations*, a *distinct and peculiar people*; so that their present state is an authentic and undeniable voucher of the truth of the Holy Scriptures (26), and themselves a living testimony

(25) See bishop Newton's Dissertation on the Prophecies, 1st vol. p. 215 to 238, where that learned author treats very fully and pathetically concerning the remarkable providence of God in the preservation of the Jews.

(26) " What is occasionally said, by Moses and
 " other prophets, concerning the future state of God's
 " people, the Jews, is, alone, sufficient to establish
 " the divine authority of the holy writings. The pro-
 " mises made to them are literally fulfilled, the ven-
 " geance denounced against them is literally inflicted.
 " Captives they were frequently made; wanderers
 " they became; and such they continue to be at this
 " day,

testimony of God's just judgement, *which they still lie under, until they shall repent.*

But Christ's *spiritual kingdom of Israel*, into which we are adopted, is everlasting; and the prophet *Isaiah* gave *Ahaz*, and his cotemporaries of *the house of David*, the strongest assurances that it should be so. — “ *Of the increase of his government*
 “ *and peace*” (says he, in the ninth chapter, which I have already shewn to have been delivered nearly at the same time with the seventh chapter) “ *there shall*
 “ *be NO END, upon the throne of David,*
 “ *and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to*
 “ *establisb it with judgement and with jus-*
 “ *tice, from henceforth even for ever :*

H 2

“ the

“ *day, sojourning in the midst of all nations, united*
 “ *with none ; peculiars every where, and by no hu-*
 “ *man means to be again consolidated : which is alto-*
 “ *gether as wonderful as if the waters of any one parti-*
 “ *cular river should remain in distinct globules, though*
 “ *scattered through the whole ocean.”* Dr. Gregory
Sharpe's 2d Argument in Defence of Christianity, &c.
 pag. 4 and 5.

“ the zeal of the Lord of hosts will per-
 “ form this.”

In page 37, Dr. W——ms says,
 “ The last objection which I know, that
 “ can be made to my sense of the pas-
 “ sage, is, that it is utterly inconsistent
 “ with the words of St. Matthew, chap.
 “ i. 22, 23.”

Here I must intirely agree with the
 Dr. though I am not the better satisfied
 with his hypothesis.

Now, that we may thoroughly under-
 stand the text in question, it will be ne-
 cessary to consider St. Matthew's appli-
 cation of it.

He informs us, that “ the birth of
 “ Jesus Christ was on this wise: When,
 “ as his mother Mary was espoused to
 “ Joseph, before they came together,
 “ she

“ she was found with *child of the Holy*
 “ *Ghost*, then Joseph, her husband, be-
 “ ing a just man, and not willing to make
 “ her a public example, was minded to
 “ put her away privily. But, while he
 “ thought on these things, behold, the
 “ *angel of the Lord* appeared unto him in
 “ a dream, saying, Joseph, THOU SON
 “ OF DAVID, fear not to take unto thee
 “ Mary, thy wife; for *that which is con-*
 “ *ceived in her* IS OF THE HOLY GHOST:
 “ and she shall bring forth a son, and
 “ thou shalt call his name Jesus, (יֵשׁוּעַ):
 “ for he shall *save his people* from their
 “ sins. Now ALL THIS *was done, that*
 “ *it might be fulfilled* which was
 “ spoken of the Lord by the pro-
 “ phet, saying, Behold, A VIRGIN shall
 “ be with child, and shall bring forth a
 “ son, and they shall call his name EM-
 “ MANUEL, which, being interpreted, is,
 “ *God with us.*” Now, Dr. W——ms
 hopes to excuse himself and his hypothe-
 sis

sis by alledging, (see page 40,) that this is only “ *an accommodation* (by way of *illustration*, not proof) of a passage to “ a particular sense, to which it *originally had no reference.*”

But should we not seem to pay very little regard to Gospel testimony, (I now speak as to Christians,) if we were to suppose, that the prophecy *originally had no reference* to this event, when an apostle *expressly affirms* that it had ?

Might not Dr. Doddridge’s observation (quoted in page 38 of the Crit. Differt.) be then, with more justice, urged against us ? *viz.* “ This way of “ proceeding will make the Scriptures “ the most uncertain writings in the “ world.” But now let us see how this notion of *an accommodation* will suit with the rest of the Doctor’s hypothesis.

He

He says, (page 44,) “ I think that
 “ the prophet had *no reference to the Mes-*
siah, and that the evangelist only al-
 “ ludes to this passage in Isaiah, because
 “ it was *remarkably suitable* to the matter
 “ which he was relating.” Now the Dr.
 seems to have forgot his former opinion,
 in page 23, *viz.* “ that the word עַלְמָה
 “ doth not appear to *signify strictly a*
 “ *virgin.*”

For, if this were true, that עַלְמָה doth
 not signify a virgin, in what sense could
 the text be esteemed *remarkably suitable*
 to the miraculous conception of a VIRGIN
 by the HOLY GHOST? And in what man-
 ner could the *accommodation of it* to that
singular event assist the sacred historian
 “ BY WAY OF ILLUSTRATION”? (See
 page 40.)

Nay, the Doctor has even taken great
 pains to render the text REMARKABLY

UN-

UNSUITABLE! for he would have us understand that העלמה the YOUNG WOMAN, (as he construes it,) spoken of in the text, was so far from being a VIRGIN that she was with child (“ IS CONCEIVING and BEARING a SON,” says he, in page 37) even at the time when she was pointed at (as he supposes, in page 31) by the prophet. These words (*viz.* “ IS CONCEIVING and BEARING a SON”) are a part of what he has given us, in page 37, as a “ *literal translation* of the “ original;” but it is so far from being so, that the true sense of *the letter*, or text, seems to be exchanged for that of the interlineary version of the London Polyglot, which renders it “ *prægnans & pariens.*”

But the words הרה וילרר are not participles active, but are in the perfect tense ; yet there needs no apology for the Septuagint and other translations in rendering them as if they were of the *future* tense,

tense, because the sentence, to which they belong, is plainly the prediction of a *future* event (27): for, in prophetic writings, the perfect is frequently used for the *future* tense. “ Apud prophetas
 “ autem creberrime (præteritum) pro
 “ futuro usurpatur, quo res certò futûra
 “ significetur, perinde ac si jam evenisset: ut puer 751 natus est nobis, pro
 “ nascetur.” BYTHNER. *Institutio Linguae Sanctæ*, p. 10. Dr. W——ms’s *literal translation* (as he calls it) of the *perfect* tense into the *participle* active cannot (I believe) be so easily vindicated.

Would it not be very unnatural to suppose, that the prophets have been intirely silent concerning this most remarkable sign of the Messiah, (*viz.* his being BORN

I

OF

(27) — “ It is a well known observation, of the
 “ Christian and Jewish doctors, that the prophet, seeing
 “ in his mind’s eye the events he foretels, often
 “ speaks of them as already past.” *Dr. Sharpe’s 2d Argument in Defence of Christianity*, p. 309. — In a note.

OF A VIRGIN,) infomuch, that an evangelist should be obliged to ACCOMMODATE, to this *singular circumstance*, a passage, which, originally, had “ *no reference to THE MESSIAH?*” And that he should attempt to pass such a MERE ACCOMMODATION upon the world for the genuine sense of the prophet, by signifying, in the strongest terms, that this text was *fulfilled* by the circumstances which he there relates?

The evangelist thus expresses himself:
 “ Now, ALL THIS WAS DONE, that it
 “ *might be fulfilled* which was spoken of
 “ the Lord by the prophet,” Εἰς. ταυτο
 δε όλον γερονεν ινα πληρωθη το ρηθεν υπο τε
 κυριε δια τε προφητε λεγοντος, Εἰς. Which
 implies, that, if ALL THIS had not come
 to pass, the *word of the Lord, by the prophet*, would not have *been fulfilled*: therefore, this case is by no means similar to the instances of ACCOMMODATION drawn
 from

from the GRECIAN POETS (28), in page 41.

But why should any one attempt, now-a-days, to explain away the genuine meaning of a prophecy, *so literally fulfilled* by the miraculous birth of Christ, when even *the Jewish interpreters*, near 300 years (*i. e.* according to the Chronicon of Eusebius, 279 years) before that wonderful event, had construed the same prophecy in such a manner, that it could not possibly be applied to any person whatsoever except the promised Messiah, who ALONE WAS BORN OF A VIRGIN?

This testimony of the Septuagint was taken notice of by Origen, (*contra Cel-*

I 2

sum

(28) The learned author, whom Dr. W.—ms has quoted in page 41, has made a very necessary reserve on this head, which the Doctor has omitted in his quotation: *viz.* “ But, indeed, to an attentive
“ mind, the difference will appear very great between
“ the citations from prophane authors and the prophets.”

sum (29), p. 27,) and is certainly of greater authority, in favour of the true sense of the word העלמה (rendered by them παρθενος, *a virgin*,) than any thing that Dr. W——ms has offered against it.

It is remarkable, that all the ancient MSS. of the Septuagint, in different parts of the world, testify the truth of this reading; of which four, in particular, are of considerable authority, on account of their very great antiquity; *viz.* the Vatican, Alexandrian, Complutensian, and Venetian, MSS. And, though many copies of the Septuagint must have been in the hands of Jews, as well as others, both before and after the birth of Christ,

yet

(29) Εάν δε Ιουδαιοὶ εὐρεσιλογῶν, το Ἰδὲ ἡ παρθεν, μὴ γεγραφθαι λείπει, ἀλλ' ἀντ' αὐτῆς, Ἰδὲ ἡ νεανίς· φησομεν πρὸς αὐτὸν, ὅτι ἡ μὲν λέξις ἡ Ἀλμα, ἣν οἱ μὲν ἐβδόμηκοντα μετετήληφασιν πρὸς τὴν παρθενον, &c. Quod si Judæus, vocabula excutiens, neget scriptum, *Ecce virginem*, sed *Ecce adolescentula*, dicemus ibi legi vocem ALMA, quam Septuaginta interpretes verterunt virginem, &c. Cambridge edition, 1677, p. 27.

yet I never heard that any person ever produced a copy which contradicted this original reading; for, as the Septuagint was the common translation used in the synagogues, throughout all Asia, Greece, and Egypt, (see bishop Walton's Prolegomena ix. p. 60. N°. 15,) any alteration, in so remarkable a text as this, would very soon have been discovered.

And it must also be remembered, that the several Greek translations, wherein the word העלמה is rendered νεανίς, *a young woman*, (*viz.* that of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus,) were all made *after the birth of Christ*, when the unbelieving Jews were desirous of perverting the true meaning of the prophecy.

The ancient Syriac version expresses העלמה by the very word (*viz.* ܒܬܘܠܐ from ܒܬܘܠܐ) which the Doctor sets up in opposition to it; and which, he justly observes,

observes, must signify strictly a VIRGIN (30). And, lastly, St. Matthew, whether he quoted the original or Septuagint, was certainly convinced that the true sense of the word was *παρθενος*, a VIRGIN, and he hath accordingly left us his testimony of it; which proves, that the Doctor's application of this word, *to the mother of Isaiah's son*, must be very erroneous.

The child, *Immanuel*, could not be Isaiah's son, because it appears, from so many undeniable testimonies, that his *mother* was to be really *a virgin*; and because *the event itself* (by which the prophecy is best understood) has proved this truth beyond all contradiction.

Wherefore,

(30) The Rabbins always by *בתולה* mean a *virgin*: that they well understand their own language cannot be denied, &c. p. 20. — See also p. 25, where, speaking of the Septuagint translation of Esther ii. 2. he adds, “ *whence it must undeniably appear, that they understood בתולה to mean A VIRGIN, in the strictest sense of the word.*”

Wherefore, I think I may now safely conclude, in Dr. W——ms's own words, before quoted, that his opinion, concerning this text, " IS UTTERLY IN-
 " CONSISTENT WITH THE WORDS OF
 " ST. MATTHEW," and, of course, that the Doctor is *indispensably bound* to yield up his hypothesis to the *superior authority of the evangelist*.

The END of PART I.

The first of these is the fact that the
 system of the 17th century was not
 designed to be a permanent one, but
 was intended to be a temporary one,
 and was to be replaced by a new
 system of the 18th century. The
 system of the 18th century was
 designed to be a permanent one,
 and was to be replaced by a new
 system of the 19th century. The
 system of the 19th century was
 designed to be a permanent one,
 and was to be replaced by a new
 system of the 20th century.

THE END

A
DISSERTATION
ON THE
NATURE AND STYLE
OF
PROPHETICAL WRITINGS:

SHEWING

That abrupt Transitions, from one Subject to
another, are frequently found therein.

The same being intended to illustrate the foregoing
Remarks on the Critical Dissertation, &c.

2001-188210

1882

1882-1883

1883

1883-1884

1884

1884-1885

1885

1885-1886

1886

A

DISSERTATION

ON THE

NATURE and STYLE

OF

PROPHETICAL WRITINGS, &c.

THE prophecies, contained in the seventh, eighth, and ninth, chapters of Isaiah, seem to have been delivered during the general consternation of the house of David, occasioned by the invasion of Rezin, king of Syria, and Pekah, king of Israel; because several circumstances, relating to the said kings and their respective nations, are

mentioned in each of these chapters (1); notwithstanding that the same chapters contain prophecies of very distant events, which are so blended with the transactions of the (then) present times, that it would not be easy to distinguish the real difference, in point of chronology, if the apparent accomplishment of these several prophecies did not remove the difficulty. Rezin and Pekah are both particularly mentioned in the 7th chapter, wherein the extraordinary birth of the *child Immanuel* is given as a sign. The spoiling of their respective cities is promised in the 8th chapter (2), wherein the birth of the child

(1) Septimum, octavum, et nonum, Isaïæ caput in eodem fere versantur argumento, &c. P. D. Huetii *Demonstratio Evangelica*, p. 291.

(2) “ For, before the child (*Mahe-shalal-basb-baz*) shall have knowledge to cry, My father and my mother, the riches of *Damascus* and the spoil of *Samaria* shall be taken away before the king of *Affyria*.” viii. 4. “ Forasmuch as this people refuseth the waters of *Shiloah*, that go softly, and rejoice in *Rezin* and *Remaliab’s son*; now, therefore, behold, the Lord bringeth upon them the

child Maher-shalal-hash-baz, the son of Isaiah, is foretold, as the temporary sign of the same: and, notwithstanding that the greatest part of the said chapter relates to those times, yet the prophet introduces, in the very midst of it, a plain reference to the times of the Messiah; see 13th, 14th, 15th, and 16th; verses, which shall be hereafter considered. In the 9th chapter, the *presumption of Ephraim* and the inhabitants of Samaria (3) is reprov'd, and God's judgements are once more expressly denounced *against Rezin*, as if these

the waters of the river, strong and many, even the king of *Affyria*," &c. — "And the stretching out of his wings shall fill the breadth of thy land, O *Immanuel*." viii. 6, 7, 8.

(3) "And all the people shall know, even *Ephraim* and the inhabitants of *Samaria*, that say, in the pride and stoutness of heart, The bricks are fallen down, but we will build with hewen stones," &c. ix. 9, 10. "Therefore the Lord shall set up the adversaries of *Rezin* against him," &c. ix. 11. These three verses, 9th, 10th, and 11th, and also the 21st, plainly allude to the subject of the 7th chapter, *viz.* the evil counsel and confederacy of *Syria* and *Ephraim*, and God's promise that the same should not stand.

these things were to happen after the birth of the *child* that was to “ be called
 “ *Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God,*
 “ *the everlasting Father, the Prince of*
 “ *peace,* of the increase of *whose govern-*
 “ *ment and peace* there should be *no end,*
 “ upon the throne of David and upon
 “ his kingdom,” &c. For the birth of
 this divine person is foretold in the former part of the same chapter; and yet I never heard of an attempt to apply this prophecy to a son of Isaiah, or to any other child born about that time.

In the beginning of this 9th chapter, the prophet alludes likewise to some other historical circumstances, besides what are already mentioned concerning Syria and Ephraim; and these had either then lately happened, or were very shortly to come to pass, notwithstanding that the allusion is blended with a very distant prophecy concerning the preaching of Christ.

The

The circumstances, which I speak of, are the Assyrian conquest and captivity of *Zebulun* and *Naphtali*, which happened in the days of Pekah, king of Israel (4). This was the affliction (5) by the “way of the sea, beyond Jordan, in *Galilee*, of the nations,” mentioned by *Isaiah*, ix. 1. by which he expressly points out the very spot, *Galilee*, where *Immanuel* was chiefly to be manifested by his mighty deeds and miracles; - for the prophet immediately proceeds, verse 2. “The people (says he) *that walked in*
“ *darkness*

(4) “In the days of Pekah, king of Israel, came Tiglathpileser, king of Assyria, and took Ijon, and Abel-beth-maa-chah, and Janoah, and Kedesh, and Hazor, and Gilead, and *Galilee*, all the land of *Naphtali*, and carried them captive to Assyria.” *2 Kings* xv. 29.

(5) “Nevertheless, the darkness shall not be such as was in her vexation, when at the first he lightly afflicted the land of *Zebulun*, and the land of *Naphtali*, and afterward did more grievously afflict her, by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, in *Galilee*, of the nations.” *Isaiah* ix. 1. “The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light,” &c. ix. 2.

“ *darkness* (6) *have seen a great light* :
 “ they that dwell in the land of the sha-
 “ dow of death, upon *them bath the light*
 “ *shined.*” And afterwards, in the 6th
 verse, he renews the same promises, gi-
 ven in the 7th chapter, concerning the
birth of a divine child, whose attributes
 and dignity are here so fully expressed,
 by the prophet, that they can by no
 means agree with the character of *any*
other child but that which was truly *Im-*
manuel, or, *God with us*. Therefore, it
 is plain, that the prophecies of the 8th
 and 9th chapters were delivered nearly
 at the same time with those of the 7th
 chapter, which are farther explained
 and

(6) This corresponds with the prejudice which the
 Jews conceived against their brethren the Galilæans.
 The chief Priests and Pharisees answered Nicodem-
 us, saying, “ Search and look ; for out of *Galilee*
ariseeth no prophet.” *John* vii. 52. In like manner an-
 swered Nathaniel, when Philip told him, “ We have
 found him of whom Moses, in the law, and the Pro-
 phets, did write, *Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph.*”
 And Nathaniel said unto him, *Can there any good thing*
come out of Nazareth ? *John* i. 45, 46.

and confirmed thereby ; so that, if Dr. W——ms will carefully examine all these three chapters, he will find, that it is *not unusual* (7), in prophetic writings, to make quick and abrupt transitions from one subject to another, *nor unnatural*, that a very distant prophecy should be blended with others that were soon to be accomplished ; because it is *the nature of prophecy* to be delivered in this mysterious manner. For (says Isaiah, xxviii. 10.)
 “ precept must be (or hath been) upon
 “ precept, precept upon precept, line up-
 PART II. L “ on

(7) See Dr. W——ms’s comment on the opinion of those who say that the 14th, 15th, and 16th, verses of the viiith chap. of *Isaiah* contain two distinct prophecies. “ Is not this (says he) *very unnatural* ? and, if I am not greatly mistaken, *very unusual* ? ” p. 9.

But an experienced writer, who, on many occasions, has given ample proofs of great learning and scripture-knowledge, informs us, that “ it is *very natural* and “ *very usual*, with the prophets, to make a *transition* “ *from one great deliverance to another, as also from one* “ *great destruction to another :*” — and he afterwards gives several remarkable instances of it. See Dr. Gregory Sharpe’s *2d Argument in Defence of Christianity*, p. 255.

“ on line, line upon line, *here a little*
 “ and *there a little*. For with stammer-
 “ ing lips and another tongue will he
 “ speak (or he hath spoken) to this peo-
 “ ple.” And again, in the 13th verse,
 “ *here a little and there a little*; that they
 “ might go and fall backward, and be
 “ broken, and snared, and taken.” The
 nature and reason of typical writings are
 strongly expressed in St. Mark’s Gospel
 (8), iv. 11, 12, 13. Wherefore, it is
 our duty to ask God’s assistance, when we
 read the scriptures, that we may under-
 stand them to our comfort, lest they
 should be a stumbling-block to us, as
 they

(8) “ And, when he (Jesus) was alone, they that
 were about him with the twelve asked of him the para-
 ble. And he said unto them, Unto you it is given to
 know the mystery of the kingdom of God; but, *unto*
them that are without, all these things are done in parables;
 that, seeing, they may see and *not perceive*; and,
 hearing, they may hear and *not understand*; lest at any
 time they should be converted, and their sins should be
 forgiven them. And he said unto them, know ye not
 this parable? and how then will you know all para-
 bles? The sower soweth,” &c. Mark iv. 10—13.

they were to the unbelieving Jews. But not only the scriptures, even Christ himself, became a stone of stumbling to the Jews : for, about the time of his coming, they universally expected a glorious and triumphant Messiah to rule over them ; infomuch, that Herod the Great was exceedingly alarmed with the apprehension of so powerful a competitor *for the throne of David*. But, when “ *the desire of all nations*” (see Haggai ii. 7.) was really come, his humble appearance, meekness, and disinterested, *though interesting*, doctrine, did not in the least correspond with their worldly imaginations ; so that “ *he was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not : he came unto his own, and his own received him not.*” John i. 10, 11. For the Jews did not then consider (any more than they do at present) that the humility of the Messiah was as expressly foretold by the prophets as his glory.

“ *Who hath believed our report?*” says
 Isaiah, in chap. liii. when he is about to
 describe the humility, afflictions, and
 death, of the Messiah. “ He hath no
 “ form nor comeliness; and, when we
 “ shall see him, there is no beauty that
 “ we should desire him: *he is despised*
 “ *and rejected of men,*” &c. See the
 whole chapter (9).

The Jews could not reconcile this un-
 expected *humility* with that glorious cha-
 racter which they so long looked for and
 desired, *viz.* “ *a king that should reign*
 “ *and prosper;*” whom “ *the Lord*” (Je-
 hovah)

(9) “ Who can read this oracle and not allow Isaiah
 “ to have been, what he is sometimes called, the
 “ Evangelical Prophet? Is not this prophecy, in eve-
 “ ry part, as applicable to Jesus as is the account gi-
 “ ven of him by the holy Evangelists? Could it have
 “ been expressed in stronger or clearer terms if written
 “ after the event? And yet it was delivered above 700
 “ years before the birth of Jesus.” Dr. Gregory Sharpe’s
2d Argument in Defence of Christianity, p. 232.

hovah) promised by Jeremiah (10) to
 “*raise up unto David,*” and who is like-
 wise

(10) “Behold the days come, saith the Lord, (יהוה *Jehovah*,) that I will raise unto David a righteous branch, and a king shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgement and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely : and this is his name whereby he shall be called, *The Lord (Jehovah יהוה) our righteousness.*” Jeremiah xxiii. 5, 6. See also xxxiii. 16. — Where the same title (יהוה) is given to the Branch of righteousness mentioned in the preceding verse. — Compare with these chap. xxx. 9. — “And they shall serve the Lord their God (יהוה אלהיהם) and David their king,” (ואת רור מלכם) “whom I will raise up unto them.” — The comparing of these texts together has occasioned the following remark, which I find wrote with a pencil in the margin of my Hebrew Bible, I suppose, by some former owner of it. “Messias vocatur David secundum carnem, Jova secundum divinitatem.” — i. e. “Christ shall be called David with respect to his human nature, and *Jehovah* with respect to his divinity.” — The divinity of the Messiah may be clearly proved, by a multitude of other passages, even in the Old Testament. Therefore, it behoves the authors of the *Critical Review* seriously to consider how those men can be justified who refuse the Son of God the honour due unto his name ; since “the Father hath committed all judgement unto the Son, that all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father.” John v. 22, 23.

wife called (as a name the most suitable to the only begotten Son of God) “*the Lord*” (Jehovah) “*our righteousness.*” This unfortunate misapprehension was plainly foretold by Isaiah, when he warned the people to “*sanctify the Lord of hosts himself,*” (יהוה צבאות אהו הקרישו) ; and (says he) “*let him be your fear, and let him be your dread.*” Now, what person could the prophet mean by this glorious title (יהוה צבאות *Jehovah Sabaoth*) if not the Messiah? for he immediately adds, “*and he shall be for a sanctuary, but (or, rather, and) for a stone of stumbling, and for a rock of offence, to both the houses of Israel, for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants*

A doctrine very opposite to this is approved and commended in the 10th article of the *Critical Review* for May, 1760; whereby it appears that the author or authors of that recommendatory criticism were not sufficiently armed against the dangerous and pernicious doctrines of the book which they undertook to recommend, viz. *The Trinitarian Controversy reviewed; or a Defence of the Appeal to the Common-Sense of all Christian People.*

“ inhabitants of Jerufalem. And many
 “ among them *shall stumble and fall*, and
 “ *be broken, and be snared, and be taken*.
 “ Bind up the *testimony*, seal the law a-
 “ mong *my disciples*.” Ifaiah 13—16.

We have the testimony of St. Paul, in his
 Epistle to the Romans, ix. 33. (11), that
 this text *relates to Christ*; for he has there
 blended a part of it with another quota-
 tion from Ifaiah xxviii. 16. (12). St.

Peter

(11) — “ for they *stumbled* at that *stumbling-stone*;
 “ as it is written, Behold, I lay in Sion a *stumbling*
 “ *stone and rock of offence*: and whosoever believeth on
 “ him *shall not be ashamed*.” Rom. ix. 32, 33.

(12) “ Therefore, thus saith the Lord God, Behold,
 “ I lay in Zion, for a foundation, a *stone, a tried stone*,
 “ a precious *corner stone*, a sure foundation: he that
 “ believeth shall not *make haste*,” (לֹא יְהִי־שָׁחַ) that is,
 he shall not be subject to that kind of *haste* which is
 commonly the effect of *fear*. Therefore the Syriac
 version has rendered it ܠܐ ܝܚܝܫ *shall not be afraid*;
 which is very expressive of the Prophet’s meaning.
 The LXX have rendered it εμη κατασχυθη; and St.
 Paul, ε κατασχυθησεται, that is, *shall not be ashamed*;
 which is still more expressive of a man’s being free from
 that *haste* or confusion caused by fear. *Not to be ashamed*
 is

Peter likewise quotes it, in his first Epistle, ii. 8. (13), and applies it to Christ. And indeed it can mean no other than “ *Ckrift crucified,*” who (as St. Paul informs us) was “ to the Jews *a stumbling block,* and unto the Greeks foolishness.” 1 Cor. i. 23. But, notwithstanding these plain testimonies, Dr. W——ms is of a very different opinion. “ *Isaiab does not seem*” (says the Dr. in a note, p. 32) “ *to speak of the Messiah till the ixth chapter.*” But, though the Dr. here allows that the ixth chapter contains a prophecy concerning the Messiah, yet, perhaps, he is not aware, that, if his reasons against the common interpretation of the viith chapter

is frequently put for *not to fear*. They shall *not be ashamed* in the evil time, says the Psalmist, xxxvii. 19. and again — they shall *not be ashamed*, but they shall speak with the enemies in the gate. Psalm cxxvii. 5.

This I hope is sufficient to reconcile the seeming disagreement between the original and St. Paul’s quotation.

(13) “ And a *stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence,* even to them which *stumble* at the word, being disobedient, whereunto also they were appointed.”

chapter (on account of “ *the present order,*
“ *and abrupt transition,*” which he complains of in p. 10) *were at all conclusive,* the same would hold good likewise against the common interpretation of this ixth chapter; wherein the *transitions* from one subject to another are equally *abrupt*, and the remote events, concerning the *birth* and *preaching* of the Messiah, are foretold, even before other events, “ *which*
“ *were immediately, or very shortly, to*
“ *happen.*” (See p. 9.)

The Dr. may be right enough in his observation, that there are no instances “ of *remote signs* to prove the accomplishment of an event near at hand:” (see pages 9 and 10.) But it is plainly his own mistake which causes the difficulty that he speaks of; for the sign, given by Isaiah, of the birth of *Immanuel*, (*viz.* behold, a virgin shall conceive, &c.) was not a remote sign of *an event near at hand*,

(as the Dr. supposes,) but a *remote sign* of *a remote event*, and therefore not liable to his censure.

The holy scriptures afford a great many other examples of prophecies which are blended and interwoven with very different subjects ; different, I say, both with respect to the matter and the time of accomplishment.

There are also many instances of passages which bear a double construction, being partly applicable to some particular person, expressly mentioned, though they ultimately and chiefly relate to another very different person.

The prophecy of Nathan, concerning Solomon, is of this kind. “ He shall
 “ build an house for my name, and I will
 “ establish the throne of his kingdom for
 “ ever. I will be his father, and he
 “ shall

“ shall be my son.” 2 Sam. vii. 13, 14. King David himself explained this more particularly to his son Solomon, and applied it to him, 1 Chron. xxii. 9. saying, “ for his name shall be *Solomon*,” (see the margin שלמה “ *peaceable*,” agreeable to Christ’s title, mentioned in the ixth chapter of Isaiah, viz. שר שלום Prince of *peace*,) “ and I will give *peace* and “ *quietness* unto Israel in his days. He “ shall build an house for my name, and “ he shall be *my son*, and I will be *his fa-* “ *ther*, and I will establish the throne of “ his kingdom over Israel *for ever*.” But where has the throne of Solomon been established, for near 1800 years last past, if not in *Jesus Christ*, the spiritual *Solomon* and *prince of peace*? For, though this prophecy plainly related to Solomon, yet it referred to a farther accomplishment in the Messiah, by whom alone it could be perfectly fulfilled; and therefore a part of it is applied immediately to

Christ, by St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, i. 5. “ I will be to him a
 “ *father*, and he shall be to me a *son*.”

Of the same kind is the lxxiid psalm, dedicated to *Solomon*. “ They shall fear
 “ *thee* as long as *the sun and moon endure*,
 “ *throughout all generations*.” This is, indeed, applied to *Solomon*; but, as the reign of that monarch was merely *temporal*, the prophecy cannot be said to be fulfilled in any other person besides the Messiah himself, the true שלמה (*Solomon*) who *reigns*, according to the Psalmist's expression, “ *throughout all generations*.”

The prophet Haggai, chap. ii. promises Zerubbabel, governor of *Judah*, and *Joshua*, the high-priest, in the name of the Lord of hosts, that “ *the desire of all nations shall come*,” and that he (the Lord of hosts) “ *will fill this house*” (that
 is,

is, the house which they were ordered to build) “with glory.” v. 7. And he adds, in the 9th verse, “The glory of
 “this latter house shall be greater than
 “of the former, saith the Lord of hosts:
 “and in this place will I give *peace*
 “(שלום) saith the Lord of hosts.”

Nevertheless, in the former part of the same chapter, the prophet appeals to those who had seen the “house in her
 “first glory. And how (says he) do you
 “see it now? Is it not, in your eyes, in
 “comparison of it, as nothing?” v. 3. Thus it is plain that the glory of the second house did not consist either in the grandeur of the building laid out by Zerubbabel and Joshua, or in the presence of those great and holy men, notwithstanding that the prophecy is addressed to them both, and that Zerubbabel is spoken to by God in a very remarkable manner, at the conclusion of the same chapter, *viz.* “I will
 “take

“ take thee, O Zerubbabel, my servant,
 “ the son of Shealtiel, saith the Lord,
 “ and will make *thee as a signet; for I*
 “ *have chosen thee*, saith the Lord of
 “ hosts.” But the glory was manifestly
 to consist in the “ *future coming, &c. of*
 “ *the desire of all nations.*” For, as the
 promise was made to Zerubbabel and Jo-
 shua themselves, the prophecy must ne-
 cessarily be understood to have a more
 distant accomplishment; which, indeed,
 the beginning of the sentence sufficiently
 proves, *viz.* היא ואני מרעיש את השמים
עוד אחת מעט *Yet once, it is a little while,*
 and *I will shake the heavens, &c.* Hag-
 gai ii. 6, 7.

The prophet Zachariah likewise pro-
 mises great things to Zerubbabel and Jo-
 shua; which he applies personally to
 them, as builders of the temple, though
 the same relate ultimately to Christ. See
 chap. iv. 6—10.

See

See also chap. vi. 11, 12, 13, wherein Joshua, by his name, (יהושע which the LXX. render *Ἰησους*, *Jesus*, signifying a Saviour,) as well as by his office and dignity of high-priest, was plainly set forth as a type of the future Messiah.

The prophet orders him to be crowned, and saluted with the prophetical title of Christ, *viz. the branch*, of whom he foretold, that he should “grow up out of his place,” and “build the temple of the Lord.”

Joshua might, indeed, be said to build the temple, as well as Zerubbabel, but he could only be a type of the branch there promised, because the real branch was yet to grow up out of his place (14).

The

(14) “And speak unto him (*Joshua*) saying, Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is the *branch*; and *he shall grow up out of his place*, and he shall build the temple of the Lord,” &c. Zech. vi. 12.

The crowns were given “*for a memorial in the temple of the Lord,*” (not of the accomplishment of this prophecy in the person of Joshua, but “*for a memorial,*”) of what *should afterwards “come to pass,” if the people would diligently obey the voice of the Lord their God* (15). Thus we find that Solomon, Zerubbabel, and Joshua, as builders of the temple, were types of the Messiah, the *true builder of the everlasting TEMPLE OF GOD*; I mean, the HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH, *properly* (16) *so called, “built upon the foundation*

(15) “And the crowns shall be to Helem and to Tobijah, &c. — *for a memorial in the temple of the Lord. And they that are far off shall come and build in the temple of the Lord, and ye shall know that the Lord of hosts hath sent me unto you. And this shall come to pass* (שְׁמוֹעַ תִּשְׁמָעוּ וְהָיָה אֲנִי) “*if ye will diligently obey the voice of the Lord your God.*” Zech. vi. 14, 15.

(16) The church of Rome is very improperly called the Catholic Church, because she causes a contradiction in terms, by usurping that *general* title to herself alone, when, at the same time, she scarcely seems intitled to be

“ tion of the Apostles and Prophets ; JE-
 “ SUS CHRIST *himself* being the chief
 PART II. N “ corner-

be esteemed a part of it. For, notwithstanding that many worthy members of Christ's catholic Church may have submitted to her communion, for want of better information, serving God by the sincerity of their intentions, yet, “ *What agreement hath the temple of God with idols?*” (2 Corinth. vi. 16.) Wherefore, “ *Come out of her,*” (ye people of God,) “ *that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.*” Rev. xviii. 4. She hath perverted the law of God (like the Scribes and Pharisees of old) by her traditions — “ *forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth.*” — Which St. Paul (1 Tim. iv. 1.) expressly called *doctrines of devils*. She hath defiled the catholic Temple of God, by building, upon the true foundation, “ *wood, hay, stubble;*” viz. infallibility, purgatory, ostentatious penance, mercenary pardons and indulgences, invocation of saints, exorcisms (“ *exorcismus aquæ;*” — “ *exorcismum salis.*” — “ *Exorcizo te, creatura salis,*” — “ *aquæ,*” &c. See the *Missale*, published by the joint-authority of the popes, Pius Quintus, Clement the 8th, and Urban the 8th) of holy water and salt, benedictions of candles, table-cloths, towels, &c. baptism of bells, and such other spiritual witchcraft — praying and bowing before images and shrines, reverencing dead mens bones, and other such abominable things, &c. &c. These are no part of the foundation (mentioned above) of the Apostles and Prophets, whose writings warrant no such idolatry, exorcisms,
 or

“ corner-stone; in whom all the build-
 “ ing, fitly framed together, groweth unto
 “ an

or enchantments : and therefore even the *Holy Scriptures* themselves are prohibited, in the popish *Index Expurgatorius*. This last is, indeed, a precaution necessary to the existence of such doctrines; for, if the poor deluded people were permitted to read the Scriptures, they would soon be informed that there is but “ *One Mediator* between God and man, the *man Christ Jesus* ;” (1 Tim. ii. 5.) and that “ there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved.”

Acts iv. 12. O that those men, who invoke the *mediation of all saints and angels*, (notwithstanding the plain doctrine of St. Peter, quoted above,) would consider what a gross affront, by *this execrable service*, they offer to Christ, who alone is the *way*, and the *truth*, and the *life* ! For their daily prayers witness against them, that they do not esteem the *mediation of Christ* sufficient for them, otherwise they would not, like the idolatrous Israelites of old, invoke “ *all the host of heaven*.” 2 Kings xvii. 16. The Church of Rome has endeavoured to cloak this abominable worship with the subtle distinctions of *latria* and *dulia* ; but the necessity of such sophistical arguments proves the reality of that church’s backsliding to idolatry. *Heathen Rome* was not more guilty of this crime, nor hath shed more innocent blood in defence of *such abominations*, under the old pagan emperors, than the present Church of Rome has done, since her *Bishops* have assumed *their seat* ; that is, have possessed themselves of the *temporal*, as well as ecclesiastical, jurisdiction of that ancient city. So that the Church of Rome may, indeed, be said to have mounted the

“ an *holy Temple* in the Lord:” in whom
 “ you (Ephesians) also are builded toge-
 “ ther for an habitation of God through
 “ the spirit!” Ephes. ii. 20, 21, 22.

Compare the above-mentioned texts
 with 1 Cor. iii. 11. John ii. 18—22.
 Luke xx. 17, 18. Acts iv. 11. Psalm
 cxviii. 22. Isaiah xxviii. 16.

It would make a large volume, if I
 were to collect all the prophecies which

N 2

abso-

the *scarlet-coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy*; (Rev. xvii. 3.) and is, accordingly, most truly described, by St. John, as a *woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus*.

Archbishop Cranmer, the bishops Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, and a great multitude of other worthy *Englishmen*, have suffered under her diabolical tyranny.

Indeed, the histories of all other European kingdoms are fraught with woful examples of it. In Sully's *Memoirs* (chap. v. p. 9.) we read that a popish prayer-book (“ *livre de grosses heures*”) served as a *passport* among the bloody messengers of popish vengeance, at the *massacre* of the Huguenots, at Paris. “ *Tuë, Tuë, ô Huguenot, ô Huguenot,*” was the devilish watch-word!

O that the living members of *that Church* may discern, and repent of, their *enormous errors* before it be too late!

absolutely relate to two different and distinct subjects in the type and antitype. Nevertheless, I am particularly obliged to take notice of two more of this kind, because Dr. W——ms has quoted them in favour of his hypothesis, notwithstanding that, upon examination, they will be found to make much against it. He says, (in p. 38,) “ It is *not possible indeed to reconcile Matthew ii. 15. 23. and perhaps some other passages in his gospel, with any particular prophecy now extant in the Old Testament.*” As to the 15th verse, wherein St. Matthew quotes the Prophet Hosea xi. 1. (“*out of Egypt have I called my son,*”) the Dr. observes, that “ the passage in Hosea, where these words are found, *is not a prophecy of a future event, but a declaration of an event long past, and therefore could not be fulfilled when the child Jesus came out of Egypt.*”

Now,

Now, in one respect, the Dr. is right, *viz.* that the passage, with regard to the people of Israel, “*is a declaration of an event long past:*” nevertheless, he has not assigned any reason why the same passage may not, *likewise*, contain a prophecy of a future event, by being intended, like many other prophecies, to bear a double application.

Erasmus has assigned a reason for the error of Julian the apostate, concerning this text, *viz.* “that he has too much followed the septuagint edition; *nimirum secutus editionem septuaginta,*” (says he,) “qui locum hunc transtulerunt in hunc modum, quia *parvulus* Israel, et ego dilexi *eum*, et ex *Ægypto* vocavi *filios ejus.*” (Annot. in Matthæum, p. 250.)

A misunderstanding of this text is very excusable, likewise, in the authors of that Greek version, who could not easily comprehend, *before the event*, that the Messiah should be called out of Egypt, as the children of Israel had been before him; and therefore they rendered the passage in such a manner as they thought would best point out the application of it to the people of Israel *only*; και ἐξ Αἰγυπτῆ μετ-καλεσα τα τέκνα αὐτῆ, “and out of Egypt “ have I called *his children*.”

But, if the *prophet himself* had intended the same thing, *and that only*, he would, most likely, have made use of terms more expressive of *a nation*, or *people*, than of *a single person*; (“*from Egypt “ have I called my son*,”—) and then the Greek interpreters would not have been obliged to leave the literal sense of the original in order to adapt it, with propriety,

propriety, to *the people of Israel*; which proves, that some *single person* is more particularly pointed at, by the prophet, than *the people of Israel*.

There are, indeed, many passages of Scripture wherein nations are represented by single persons: Ezekiel warned the *two houses of Israel* under the figure of two adulterous women, Aholah and Aholibah, &c. But the text in question is very different from many others of that kind; for the people of Israel are not only represented therein under the figure of a *single person*, but some eminent single person is likewise plainly represented, at the same time, under the *name and figure* of the *people of Israel*; of which the particularity of the style affords evident testimony; לבני כי נער ישראל ואהבהו וממצרים קראתי “when Israel was *a little child*, “and I loved him, and out of Egypt “have I *called my son*.” But the follow-
ing

ing part of the text, wherein Israel could not be a type of the Messiah, (I mean, their forsaking God's commandments and sacrificing to Baal,) is immediately expressed in *the plural number*, as being applicable to the children of Israel *only*, and not to Christ ; להם כו' הלכו מפניהם " as " *they called them, so they went from them : they sacrificed unto Baalim, and* " burnt incense to graven images." Hosea xi. 2. Thus it is plain that the text is applicable, in the first place, to *the children of Israel*, who were brought by God out of Egypt, when *they first began* to be esteemed a nation, and therefore might, as a type of Christ, be likened to *a little child*, being *young and weak*, in comparison of *their future state and power*. And, 2dly, it is undoubtedly very applicable to the *single person* of the Messiah, who was *also called by God out of Egypt* when he was *really a little child* (17),

(17), according to the plain literal meaning of the passage referred to by St. Matthew, who quoted the *sense of the Hebrew text*, and not that of the Septuagint version.

The *child*, mentioned by Hosea as *having been called* (18) out of Egypt, is, indeed, expressly named *Israel*; but this is so far from setting aside the application to Christ, that, on the contrary, it affords the strongest confirmation of it: for this name was necessarily given, in the prophecy, that the application might be

PART II. O double;

(17) *Before he could know to refuse the evil and choose the good*; the land being then forsaken of *both her kings*, according to Isaiah's prophecy, vii. 16. For the angel's message (or call of Christ out of Egypt) was delivered to Joseph upon the death of king Herod the Great, at which time, *precisely*, the last of *the two monarchies* was dissolved.

(18) The prophecy was, indeed, delivered in the *perfect tense*, as a thing already past; but this did not prevent the application of it to the *future Messiah*, because the *perfect tense* is almost as frequently used, by the prophets, in declaring *futurity*, even as the *future* itself.

double; *viz.* first to the people of Israel, and lastly to the Messiah.

The Messiah is expressly called *Israel* by *Isaiah*, (xlix. 3.) in a prophecy which cannot, *at all*, be applied to the *people of Israel*, like the former, but must relate *entirely* to Christ: *viz.* “*Thou art my servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified.*” (xlix. 3.)

Indeed, the true sense and application of this passage does not appear without the context: nevertheless, I am not sorry for the necessity of a long quotation from this chapter, because it will convey a very clear and distinct idea of the birth and office of the Messiah, at the same time that it proves the point in question.

“Listen, O isles, unto me, and hear-
ken, ye people from far; the Lord hath
called

called me *from the womb* (19), from the bowels of my mother hath he made mention of my name (20). And he hath made my mouth like a *sharp sword* (21); in the shadow of his hand hath he hid me, and made me a *polished shaft*; in his quiver hath he hid me, and said unto me, *Thou art my servant, O Israel*, in whom I will be glorified. Then I said, I have laboured in vain, I have spent my strength for naught and in vain, yet surely my judgement is with the Lord, and my work with

O 2

my

(19) — “ the angel of the Lord appeared unto him (Joseph) in a dream, saying, Joseph, *thou son of David*, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy-Ghost : and she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name *Jesus* ;” (עֲשֵׂה; יֵשׁוּעַ a Saviour) ; “ for he shall save his people from their sins.” Matt. i. 20, 21.

(20) — “ and behold, (said the angel,) thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a Son, and shalt call his name *Jesus*.” (Luke i. 31.)

(21) — “ he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips he shall slay the wicked.” Isaiah xi. 4. See the context also.

my God. And now, saith the Lord, that formed *me* from the womb to be his *servant*, to bring *Jacob* again to him, though *Israel* be *not gathered*," (here is a plain prophecy that *blindness, in part, should happen to Israel*,) "yet shall *I* be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my God shall be my strength. And *he* said, it is a *light thing* that *thou* shouldest be my *servant*, to raise up *the tribes of Jacob*, and to restore the preserved of *Israel*; I will also give *thee* for a *light to the Gentiles* (22), that thou mayest be my *salvation* unto the end of the earth." "Thus saith the Lord, the Redeemer of *Israel*, and his *Holy One*, to him whom *man despiseth* (23), to him whom the nation abhorreth,

(22) "I, the Lord, have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a *covenant of the people*, for a *light of the Gentiles*, to open the *blind eyes*," &c. Isaiah xlii. 6, 7. "A *light to lighten the Gentiles*, and the glory of thy people *Israel*." Luke ii. 32.

(23) "He is *despised and rejected of men*, a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief; and we hid, as
" it

horreth, to a servant of rulers," &c. — Thus far may, perhaps, be sufficient to shew the nature and design of the prophecy. Isaiah has introduced the important subject as the narrative of a dialogue between two distinct persons, who are both mentioned in this last (the 7th) verse; viz. "the Lord, (יהוה) the Redeemer of "Israel," and "his *Holy One*, (קדושו) "whom man *despiset*h," and who is also called *Israel*, in the former part of this chapter. Now, it is remarkable, that the people of *Israel*, or tribes of *Jacob*, are likewise distinctly mentioned in the same prophecy; so that the person, to whom the Lord said, "*Thou art my servant, O Israel*," (see 3d verse,) cannot mean any other person besides the Messiah himself, he alone being the true "*light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of*"
"his

"it were, our faces from him; he was *despised*, and we "esteemed him *not*. Surely he hath borne our griefs," &c. Isaiah liii. 3, 4.

“ *his people ISRAEL.*” For, though the *Jewish Religion* was, for many ages, the only true religion, yet the *Gentiles* were not induced, universally, to acknowledge the truth of the holy Scriptures, by becoming profelytes to *Judaism*, but by being *converts to Christ*, by whom alone they have been *enlightened* according to the Scriptures. If all these things be considered, they will (I doubt not) afford sufficient proof, that the text, quoted by St. Matthew from Hosea xi. 1. (though introduced in a context absolutely relating to the *people of Israel*,) was, nevertheless, prophetically intended to be applied likewise to some *single person*, and that the same was eminently fulfilled in the person of *Jesus Christ*, the only begotten *Son* of God, whom the Father *called out of Egypt* by his angel. Jacob, and the children of *Israel*, may, indeed, be called the *Sons of God*, but it must be in a very different sense from the former; for they are only
types

types of the true *Israel*, (יִשְׂרָאֵל) the Prince of God, who gave this name to Jacob, when he wrestled with him, that he might render him more conspicuously a type of himself; viz. as one that had “power with God, and with men, and had prevailed.” Jacob was sensible of the *divine presence*, and therefore called the name of the place *Peniel*, (פְּנֵי אֵל) or (as it is expressed in the margin) *the face of God*; for (said he) “I have *seen God face to face, and my life is preserved*.” Gen. xxxii. 28, 29, 30.

I have already said so much concerning the nature of prophecy in general, and have quoted so many examples of two different subjects being referred to by one and the same prophetic expression, that (I hope) I need not any longer urge the reasonableness of a double application, likewise, of the text quoted by St. Matthew from the prophet Hosea; especial-
ly

ly as Dr. W——ms has not assigned any one reason why it ought to be otherwise; nor any authority whatsoever for his assertion, in page 39, that the passage “ *could not be fulfilled when the child Jesus came out of Egypt,*” except, indeed, the authority of his own bare word; which, nevertheless, seems to have had sufficient weight with the Critical Reviewers, though it is opposed to the *express testimony* even of an *Evangelist*.

The other quotation of St. Matthew, which Dr. W——ms has called in question, is given in the 2d chap. 23d verse: viz. “ *He shall be called a Nazarene.*” This is one of the texts concerning which the Dr. affirms, in page 38, that “ *it is not possible to reconcile*” (it) “ *with any particular prophecy now extant in the Old Testament.*” But he is greatly mistaken in this; for the text may certainly be reconciled not only with one prophecy, but

but with many very *particular prophecies* “ now extant in the *Old Testament* ;” and therefore St. Matthew appeals with *great propriety, in this case*, not to one prophet alone, but to the *sense of all the prophets in general*, viz. το ῥηθεν δια των προφητων, that “ which was *spoken by the prophets*.”

For, though the prophets do not say expressly that “ *he shall be called a Nazarene*,” yet many of them do plainly allude to this appellation. Our Lord was called a *Nazarene*, notwithstanding that he was born at Bethlehem, the city of David, according to the Scriptures (24). He was sometimes called Ναζωραιῶς (25),

PART II. P and

(24) “ But thou, Beth-lehem Ephratah, though “ thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet “ out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is *to be* “ ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of “ old, from everlasting.” Micah v. 2. Compare this with Matt. ii. 5. and John vii. 42.

(25) Mark x. 47. Luke xviii. 37. xxiv. 19. John xviii. 5. xix. 19. and seven times in Acts.

and sometimes Ναζαρην (26); synonymous terms for a *Nazarene* or inhabitant of *Nazareth*; which (as Dr. Hammond expounds it) signifies “ *The City of the*
 “ *Branch*, or where the Messiah (*the*
 “ *Branch*) should be brought up; and
 “ accordingly (says the Doctor) this be-
 “ comes Christ’s vulgar title, Ναζωραι”
 — “ Ναζαρην,” &c.

Now the Messiah is called מִנְיָ *the Branch* by Isaiah iv. 2. Jeremiah xxiii. 5. and Zechariah iii. 8.

A plant, or branch, is the usual scripture-emblem for a child. — “ *Thy*
 “ *children*, like *olive-branches*, round a-
 “ bout thy table,” says the Psalmist in the cxxviiith Psalm, 3^d verse: and, in Psalm cxliv. 12. we read — “ that our
 “ *sons* may grow up as the *young plants*.”
 Therefore the prophets very fitly expressed

(26) Mark i. 24. xiv. 67. xvi. 6. and Luke iv. 34.

ed the *childhood* and *growth* of the Messiah by the word צֶמַח before-mentioned ; for it properly signifies, not only a *Branch*, but *Germen*, a *Bud*, or young twig ; which Isaiah farther explains, in the liiid chap. 2d verse, by the word יֹנֵק a *tender plant*, or *sucker* ; which is not only a fit emblem of the once *infant state* of the Messiah, but also of his *gradual increase* in strength and wisdom : for “ he shall
 “ *grow up* before him (says the prophet)
 “ as a *tender plant*, and as a *root* out of
 “ a dry ground ;” by which he assigns the true reason of Christ’s being called the *Branch*. Indeed this whole chapter contains so perfect a description of Christ’s human state upon earth, that no miracle or demonstration whatsoever can be more capable of affording conviction ; and, consequently, those, who have read it and still disbelieve, are inexcusable. The prophet Zechariah (vi. 12.) speaks of the *growth* of Christ, *the Branch*, in the

same kind of terms, ומהרהר יצמח “ He
 “ *shall grow up out of his place* ;” or, as
 it is properly rendered in the margin, —
 “ he shall *branch up* from under him.”
 Moreover, this prophet foretold, in the
 same verse, that he should be named the
Branch. — הנה איש צמח שמו “ Be-
 “ hold the man (27), whose *name* is the
 “ *Branch* ;” plainly alluding, by the sense
 (though not the sound) of this appella-
 tion, to Christ’s being surnamed (28) the
Nazarene, from *Nazareth*, the city of
 the *Branch*.

But Isaiah, in the xith chap. 1st verse,
 not only alludes to the sense and meaning
 of

(27) Zechariah commanded that this prophecy should
 be spoken to Joshua (or Jesus) the high-priest, in the
 time of Zerubbabel ; but I have already shewn that he
 was therein only a type of our Lord Jesus, the true
branch.

(28) — secessit (Joseph) in partes Galilææ, —
 ibique habitavit in urbe *Nazareth*, unde et Christus
Nazareni cognomentum accepit, (Matt. ii. 22, 23.) et
Nazarenorum Christiani. (Acts xxiv. 5.) *J. Usserii*
Annalium pars posterior, p. 536.

of this surname, but to the very sound of it; for he intitles him נצר *Netser*, a *Branch*. Now Christ was really called, in the common Syriac dialect, נצר *Netseria*, a *Netserian*, or *Nazarene*, from נצר *Netsereth*, (called, from the Greek, *Nazareth*,) where he had been brought up, (Luke iv. 16.) and where (according to the true meaning of the appellation, *Netserian*, or *Nazarene*, when interpreted) he *grew up* as a *Plant* or *Branch*; for St. Luke informs us (ii. 40.) that “*they*” “(*viz.* Joseph and Mary, with the young “*child*) returned into Galilee, to their “own city, *Nazareth*; and the *child* grew, “and waxed strong in spirit, filled with “wisdom; and the grace of God was “upon him.”

And again, in the 52d verse. —
 “*Jesus increased in wisdom and stature,*
 “and in favour with God and man.”
 This exactly corresponds with Jeremiah’s
 prophecy,

prophecy, (xxxiii. 15.) viz. “ In those
 “ days, and at that time, (צֶמַח צְדָקָה
 “ אֶצְמַח לְדָוִד) will I cause the *Branch* of
 “ righteousness to *grow up* unto David.”

If all this be considered, I think the fitness of St. Matthew's appeal to the prophets, concerning the word Ναζωραῖος, cannot be called in question; unless, like the *Critical Reviewers*, (fol. 357.) we should believe, from Dr. W-----'s *bare word*, that Ναζωραῖος signifies a *Nazorite*; which interpretation would, indeed, render it impossible “ *to reconcile Matthew ii. 23. with any particular prophecy now extant in the Old Testament;*” according to the Doctor's assertion in p. 38.

For the Doctor informs us, in the following page, (39.) that “ *the word is not* “ Ναζωραῖος, *a Nazarene, but* Ναζωραῖος, *a Nazorite:*” nevertheless it is certain that both these words signify the *same thing*,
 viz.

viz. a *Nazarene*, (or inhabitant of *Nazareth*;) and, likewise, that neither of them can signify a *Nazarite*, or (as he spells it) *Nazorite*.

For, the Hebrew word נָזִיר *separatus*, from whence these last (*Nazarite* or *Nazorite*) are derived, is no where in Scripture rendered Ναζωραῖος or Ναζαρεῖος, but is distinguished from them by an *iota* in the second syllable, viz. Ναζιρ, a *Nazarite*, Judges xiii. 5. and Ναζιραῖοι, *Nazarites*, Lamentations iv. 7. Besides, it is very plain, throughout the whole New Testament, that Christ was not called Ναζωραῖος as being a *Nazarite*, (for he could not properly be called so according to the law of Moses, though John the Baptist was really such,) but on account of his having been brought up at the city of Nazareth, which in the Syriac tongue was called ܢܝܨܝܢ (not with ܝ or ܝ as *Nexereth*, but with ܝ or ܝ) *Netsereth*; for the
word

word is plainly derived from עֵצ *a Branch*, the name which the prophet Isaiah has given to the Messiah himself, (as is before observed,) and therefore St. Matthew's appeal to the prophets in this case is very easily *reconciled* with the prophecies "*now extant in the Old Testament*," though the Doctor has declared that the same "*is not possible*."

Even Christ himself condescended sometimes to prophecy in the same kind of style that had before been used by his servants the prophets. "Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall *not taste of death*, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." Matth. xvi. 28. And again, "If I will that he (John) *tarry till I come*, what is that to thee?" John xxi. 22. Here our Lord makes use of "*the same words and phrases*" with which he was wont to express his *second coming to judge*

judge the world ; so that his disciples understood that John should not die ; whereas the event plainly shewed that he “ meant of his *coming*” (so often mentioned in the New Testament) “ in “ judgement upon the Jews at the final “ overthrow of Jerusalem, which St. “ John outlived many years.” See Dr. Cave *on the Life of that Disciple*, Antiquitates Apostolicæ, p. 158.

Our Lord likewise “ *used the same “ words and phrases*” unto these *two different subjects*, viz. his *coming* in judgement upon Jerusalem, and his last *coming* to judge the world, “ when occasion “ was to speak of them together,” according to the observation before quoted from Assemblies Annotations ; inasmuch that the *day of judgement* and the *end of the world* were expected to follow immediately after the accomplishment of Christ’s prophecies, in the xxivth chap.

PART II.

Q

of

of Matthew, xiiiith of Mark, and xxist of Luke, concerning *God's judgement in the destruction of Jerusalem.*

The latter, however, may indeed be considered as a sign, or type, of the *great and last day*; and the accomplishment of the prophecies concerning it is undoubtedly a sure pledge of *God's future judgement*: just in the same manner as the *temporary deliverance* from Rezin and Pekah, promised to Ahaz and the house of David by Ifaiah, was properly the confirmation and pledge of the future distant deliverance, promised in the person of *Immanuel*. Therefore, if Dr. W-----ms supposes (as he hints in the words of Mr. Collins in page 7.) that this sign stood in need of other signs to manifest that God would perform it in time, let him consider the context once more, and he will find that the sign was not without such a manifestation as Mr. Collins and himself have

have required. Perhaps it may be said that I have troubled my readers with a great many more examples of “ *types*, “ *figures*, and *secondary senses*,” than were necessary for the point in question ; but I was induced thereto by the too hasty censure passed on this sort of writings by the authors of the *Critical Review* in page 349. where they seem to condemn all *types*, &c. whatsoever, indiscriminately, without deigning to distinguish the difference between *proper types* and *imaginary* ones.

The END of PART II.

A
DISSERTATION

ON

ISAIAH vii. 8.

PART III.

A
 DISSERTATION
 ON
 ISAIAH vii. 8.

— “ *Within threescore and five years*
 “ shall Ephraim be broken, that it be
 “ not a people.”

THE accomplishment of Isaiah’s
 prophecy (in confirmation of
 which he required Ahaz to ask
 a sign) was not “ *an event near at hand,*”
 as Dr. W-----ms supposes; for, no less a
 term than sixty-five years was allowed for
 the accomplishment of one of the circum-
 stances contained in it; viz. — “ *within*
 “ *threescore*

“ *threescore and five years shall Ephraim*
 “ *be broken, that it be not a people.*”
 Isaiah vii. 8.

Nevertheless, the king, or regal government of Ephraim, (or Israel, for Ephraim in this text seems to be put for the ten tribes of Israel as separated from Judah,) lasted no longer than about twenty-one years after the prophecy was delivered; for, “ *in the ninth year of Hoshea,*” (the sixth of Hezekiah,) “ *the king of*
 “ *Affyria took Samaria, and carried Israel*
away into Affyria,” (2 Kings xvii. 6.) therefore commentators have generally found it very difficult to account for the number of *sixty-five years* mentioned in this prophecy.

A very learned and justly-esteemed author (1), in order to solve the difficulty, has applied several texts in the second
 book

(1) Bishop Newton on the Prophecies.

book of Kings to an imaginary captivity, or carrying away, by Efarhaddon, which, if the context be carefully considered, will be found to relate, undoubtedly, to the *real* captivity under Salmanassar. We understand, indeed, from Ezra iv. 2. that the adversaries of Benjamin and Judah (the Samaritans) dated the time of their settlement in the cities of Samaria from “ *the days of Efarhaddon, king of Assur,*” “ *whick (as they said) brought us up hither.*” But there is no necessity to suppose that Efarhaddon carried any people away into captivity from thence, nor any evidence to support such a supposition. Was it not possible for Efarhaddon to plant fresh colonies in the land of Israel, where it was too thinly inhabited by the former colonies, without having carried away any of the inhabitants into captivity? Surely it was not only possible, but most probable, that this was really the case; notwithstanding that several other learned

men, besides Bp. Newton, have thought otherwise; and particularly Fr. Junius, quoted by Dr. Simson in his *Chronicon Catholicum*, (pars 3tia, p. 69.) But the Doctor himself sufficiently accounts for the passages in Ezra, (ch. iv. 2 and 10.) so that there is no necessity to suppose another captivity under Esarhaddon: —

“ Quamquam enim Salmanasar illam co-
 “ loniam primus deduxerit, tamen cum
 “ plurimi incolarum à feris, et fortè pesti-
 “ lentiâ, (sic enim ait Josephus libro no-
 “ no,) extincti essent, postea plures ab
 “ Asarhaddone illuc missos fuisse *veri-*
 “ *simile est.*” And he likewise quotes
 Nicholas Brabantinus to the same pur-
 pose: — “ Leones enim vastaverunt mag-
 “ nam partem populi quem Salmanassar
 “ miserat: propter quod iste Asarhaddon
 “ misit alios loco ipsorum, et cum iis
 “ unum de sacerdotibus captivis, qui do-
 “ ceret eos colere Dominum.”

The prophet does not say that *Ephraim shall be broken from a kingdom in sixty-five years*, but that within such a time he shall be *broken from a people*; therefore it is plain that the prophecy could not be accomplished by the captivity of Ephraim and the destruction of the *regal government* of Samaria by Salmanassar; because Ephraim, or the children of Israel, might be still called *a people*, or nation, even after their removal into a strange country; for they could not be said to “*be broken from a people*,” until the judgements denounced against them by the prophet Amos (ix. 4.) should be fulfilled, *viz.* “*Though they go into captivity before their enemies, thence will I command the sword, and it shall slay them.*”

It appears, from the history of Tobit, that this really came to pass; for he speaks of the frequent slaughter made of *the*

people of *his nation* by Sennacherib, chap. i. 17, 18. “ *for in his wrath he slew many.*” And, even in the reign of Esharhaddon, about *sixty-five years* after Isaiah’s prophecy, notwithstanding that Achiarcharus, Tobit’s nephew, was appointed over all the king’s affairs, (21st verse,) we find an instance recorded of the continuation of this persecution.

For, when Tobit was told (chap. ii. 3.) that one of his nation was strangled and cast out in the market-place, he remembered (6th verse) “ *that prophecy of Amos,*” as he said, (see Amos viii. 10.) Your “ feasts shall be turned into mourning, “ and all your mirth into lamentation:” for it was then the *feast of pentecost*, or seven weeks, and Tobit had sent out to invite such of his poor brethren as feared the Lord, that they *might partake of the “ good dinner which was prepared;”* but, in the mean time, he received this melancholy

lancholy account ; (see 1st, 2d, and 3d, verses ;) which proves the propriety of his quotation from Amos. The same chapter of Amos contains a passage very suitable to my purpose, (viii. 2, 3.)

“ *The end is come upon my people of Israel* ; I will not again pass by them any more. And the songs of the temple shall be howlings in that day,” (see the 10th verse, quoted by Tobit, — “ *and all your songs into lamentation,*”) saith the Lord God, *there shall be many dead bodies in every place, they shall cast them forth with silence.*” I am sensible that the apocryphal book of Tobit ought not to be considered of sufficient authority for the proof of any thing ; yet I hope that the remarkable correspondence it bears to the subject in question will excuse my quotation.

Moses

Moses also prophesied that the captives of Israel should be persecuted; — “ *I will scatter you among the heathen, and will draw out a sword after you.*” Levit. xxvi. 33.

So we need not doubt but that, by this and other such heavy judgements of God, the captives of the ten tribes of Israel would be so much reduced in number within the *term of threescore and five years* mentioned by Isaiah, that Ephraim might well be said to be *broken from a people*; for we read, in Deut. xxviii. 61, 62. “ *Also every sickness and every plague which is not written in the book of this law, them will the Lord bring upon thee, until thou be destroyed. And ye shall be left few in number,*” (which agrees well with the expression of Isaiah concerning Ephraim’s being “ *broken, that it be not a people,*” viz. being now left
few

few in number,) “whereas ye were as the
“stars of heaven for multitude.”

The completion of Isaiah's prophecy concerning Ephraim is very apparent even in another way; for, though some of Ephraim, and of all the other tribes, were afterwards settled in Judæa and other places; though we read of *a remnant of Israel* (see 2 Chron. xxxiv. 9.) that contributed to the repairing of the temple in the reign of Josiah, king of Judah, long after the completion of *the sixty-five years* limited by Isaiah; and though Manasseh and Ephraim are expressly mentioned on the same occasion; nevertheless, this remnant of Ephraim, or Israel, could have no pretensions, as before, to be esteemed a separate people, or nation, from Judah, because they were once more become subject to the laws and regal government of *the tribe of Judah*, of which the authority exercised among them by
Josiah

Josiah is a sufficient proof ; and therefore, notwithstanding that on some particular occasions they were distinguished by their tribes, yet, as a body, or nation, they were generally afterwards esteemed a *part of the tribe of Judah* ; which accounts for the expression of the historian, (2 Kings xvii. 18.) “ *There was none left but the* “ *tribe of Judah only ;*” that is, there was none left but part of the tribes of Levi, Benjamin, and such individuals of the other tribes as lived in (or might have escaped into) the inheritance of Judah, and consequently were all considered as the proper subjects of *the kingdom of Judah*, and have ever since borne *the name of that tribe*, viz. יהודים *Jews*. Thus the title of *Jews* became general about this time to all the other tribes as well as Judah ; for the kingdom of *Israel* was never afterwards restored in a separate state from Judah ; and therefore, after the captivity by Salmanassar, *the land*
which

which Abaz vexed might be said to “ *be forsaken of*” one of “ *her kings,*” (2) or regal governments.

But the succession of the kings of Judah continued regularly until the Babylonish captivity ; and on account of this interruption (or of others afterwards) the land could not be said to be *forsaken of both her kings*, if the regal government was to be afterwards restored for any considerable length of time : and we find *that many kings reigned in Judah* after that period. I have already observed, that, when *Ephraim* was *broken from a people*, the national name of *Jews* became general to all the other tribes as well as Judah ; but it is likewise remarkable, that about the same time the whole Jewish nation, (including Judah and Benjamin,)

PART III.

S

as

(2) “ For, before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of BOTH HER KINGS.” Isaiah vii. 16.

as descendants of Jacob, began once more to be called *Israel*, as they had formerly been before the revolt of the ten tribes. In the second book of Chron. xxxv. 3. (3) the Levites, that taught *all Israel*, are exhorted to serve the Lord their God, and *his people Israel*; meaning the whole nation. Isaiah, in the fortieth chapter, (27th verse (4),) and several succeeding chapters, speaks of the whole Jewish nation under the title of *Jacob* and *Israel*: for, though he might write these chapters before the change that I speak of, yet it must be considered that he is addressing himself to the people in the spirit of

(3) — “ And said unto the Levites that taught
“ *all Israel*, which were holy unto the Lord, Put the
“ holy ark in the house, &c. — serve now the Lord
“ your God and *his people Israel*.” 2 Chron. xxxv. 3.

(4) “ Why sayest thou, O *Jacob*, and speakest, O
“ *Israel*, my way is hid from the Lord, and my judge-
“ ment is passed over from my God?” Isaiah xl. 27.
— “ But *thou, Israel*, art my servant, Jacob, whom I
“ have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend.” Chap.
xli. 8. — “ Fear not, thou *worm Jacob*, and ye men of
“ *Israel*.” Verse 14. See also chap. xliii.

of prophecy, and plainly refers to the latter times. Ezekiel (iii. 4.) (5) was sent unto the *house of Israel*, meaning the Jews that were carried into captivity with Jehoiakim: "Get thee to them of the "captivity," &c. (see the 11th verse.) Many of the other prophets expressed themselves in the same manner. See Zech. xii. 1. (6) Malachi i. 1. (7) Ezra iv. 3. &c. (8). So that the national names of *Israel* and *Jews* were now considered as synonymous terms; for *Ephraim*, the chief of the ten tribes, was now *broken from a people*, and therefore the name of *Israel* did not generally distinguish them as a separate *nation*, or *people*, as before;

S 2

though,

(5) "Son of man, go, get thee unto *the house of Israel*," &c. Ezek. iii. 4.

(6) "The burden of the word of the Lord for *Israel*," &c. Zech. xii. 1.

(7) "The burden of the word of the Lord to *Israel* by Malachi," i. 1.

(8) "But Zerubbabel and Jeshua, and the rest of the chief of the *fathers of Israel*," &c. Ezra iv. 3.

though, indeed, both *Ephraim* and the *two houses of Israel* (the house of Judah and the house of Israel) were sometimes, afterwards, on particular occasions, distinctly mentioned; as in the thirty-first (9) and fiftieth (10) chapters of Jeremiah and eighth of Zechariah.

Nevertheless, *all the nation were the children of Israel! all were Jews!* and in length of time the *remnant of Israel* was so blended with *Judah*, that many intirely lost the distinction of their tribes, (Ezra ii. 62.) (11) and more especially after the
Babylonish

(9) “ Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that
“ I will make a new covenant with *the house of Israel*,
“ and with the house of *Judah*.” Jerem. xxxi. 31.

(10) — “ In those days, and in that time, saith the
“ Lord, *the children of Israel* shall come, they and *the*
“ *children of Judah* together, going and weeping: they
“ shall go, and seek the Lord their God.” Jer. l. 4.
This was plainly fulfilled after the Babylonish captivity, as the following verses testify: — “ Remove out of
“ *the midst of Babylon*,” &c. Verses 8, 9, 10.

(11) “ These sought their register among those that
“ were reckoned by genealogy, but they were not
“ found.” Ezra ii. 62.

Babylonish captivity, when the prophecy of Ezechiel seems plainly to be fulfilled.

“ Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I
 “ will take the stick of Joseph, *which is*
 “ *in the hand of Ephraim*, and the tribes
 “ of Israel his fellows, and will put them
 “ *with him, even with the stick of Judah*,
 “ and make them ONE STICK, and they
 “ shall be ONE in mine hand.” Chap.
 xxxvii. 19. And, in the 22d verse, “ I
 “ will make them *one nation* in the land
 “ upon the mountains of Israel, and *one*
 “ *king* shall be king to them all: and
 “ they shall be no more *two nations*, nei-
 “ ther shall they be divided into *two king-*
 “ *doms* any more at all.”

Agreeably to this prophecy, the children of Israel were *one nation*, and under *one king* (that is, a succession of kings reigning one by one) during the reigns of all the Asmonean princes, as well as that of Herod the Great, until Shiloh (the Prince

Prince of peace) was come, according to the prophecy of the patriarch Jacob, recorded in Genesis xlix. 10. viz. “ *The*
 “ *sceptre shall not depart from Judah*, nor
 “ *a lawgiver from between his feet, until*
 “ *Shiloh come*, and unto him shall the gathering of the people be.”

The END of PART III.

A

DISSERTATION

ON

GENESIS xlix. 10.

“ The sceptre shall not depart from Ju-
“ dah, nor a lawgiver from between
“ his feet, until Shiloh come, and un-
“ to him shall the gathering of the
“ people be.”

P A R T IV.

A
D I S S E R T A T I O N
O N
G E N E S I S xlix. 10.

IN the preceding Dissertation concerning Ephraim, I have observed, that the sceptre was continued in the inheritance of Judah during the reigns of all the Asmonæan princes.

And I believe the Jews themselves will not deny, that the said reigns include a part of the continuation of the sceptre in Judah, as promised by the patriarch Jacob: therefore, I presume, it will not be necessary for me to examine the Jewish
PART IV. T histories

histories farther back than the time when the sceptre was translated into the family of Antipater; so that I propose to begin this Dissertation where I left off in the last; *viz.* with the reign of Herod the Great.

Herod had as much right to be esteemed a Jew, or of the tribe of Judah (1), as the Asmonæan princes of the tribe of Levi: for not only the descendants of the twelve tribes were called Jews, after the Babylonish captivity, (as I have before observed,) but even the *profelytes of the* Jews,

(1) The ingenious Mr. Mann, in the first section of his 6th chapter *de anno natali Christi*, endeavours to prove that Herod was really a Jew. There are likewise several other parts of that learned book which would both illustrate and confirm many of the points which I have advanced; nevertheless, as I cannot entirely agree with him in all his opinions, and as I had finished my remarks (except a short addition at the end of this Dissertation) before I had the satisfaction of reading his work, I shall therefore content myself with referring my readers to the book itself.

Jews, though they were by birth *Gentiles* of any other nation whatsoever (2).

This is strongly expressed by Josephus, in his account of king Izates, the great Adiabedian proselyte. See Jewish Antiquities, (20th book,) (3) νομιζων τε μη ανειναι βεβαιως Ισδαιῶ, ει μη περιτεμοίῳ, πραττειν ην ετοιμῶ. Which is thus rendered by Gelenius: “ Cumque existi-
“ maret se non esse *perfectum Judæum*,
“ nisi circumcideretur, paratus erat et
“ hoc facere.” And again—εκ ανεξε-
στῳαι τε βασιλευοντος αυτω Ισδαια.—“ Ne-
“ que ullo pacto laturos *Judæum* in regio
“ folio.” The Idumæans, (or Edo-
T 2 mites,)

(2) — ἦτε γὰρ χώρα, Ιουδαια, και αυτοι, Ιουδαιοι, ωνομαδαι. ἡ δὲ επικλησις αὐτῇ ἐκείνοις μὲν οὐκ οἶδ' ὅθεν ἤρξατο γενεσθαι, φερει δὲ και ἐπὶ τῆς ἀλλῆς ἀνθρωπων, ὅσοι τὰ νομιμα αυτων, και ὡς αλλοεθνεῖς οντες, ζήλῳσι. Dio Cassius, lib. 36. p. 37.

(3) The Orleans edition of Josephus, printed in 1611, (fol. 685.) which is referred to as often as Josephus is quoted in these remarks.

mites,) (4) from whom Herod was descended, were not only profelytes to the Jewish religion, but were still more nearly connected with the Jews, by having been governed by the same princes and laws from the time that they were conquered by John Hyrcanus, the nephew of Judas Maccabæus; *so that from that time they were accounted Jews*, as Josephus testifies, Antiq. 13th book, 17th chap. fol. 450. κακειν αὖτοις χρόνῳ ὑπηρχεν, ὥς ἐστιν το λοιπον Ἰδδαίους. And they were afterwards as zealous for the rights and liberties of Jerusalem (which they esteemed *their metropolitan city*) as the native Jews themselves. See Jewish War, book iv. chap. 16. page 887. — και παντες ὡς ἐπ' ἐλευθερια της μητροπολεως ἤρπαζον τα ὄπλα. Thus it appears that the Idumæans, as a nation, had certainly a right to be esteemed *Jews*.

But

(4) “Thou shalt not abhor an *Edomite*, for he is thy brother.” Deut. xxiii. 7.—i. e.—The patriarch Edom (which is Esau, see Gen. xxv. 30.) was Jacob’s brother.

But king Herod's claim of relationship did not depend upon this single circumstance of his being descended from the Idumæans: his connections with the Jews were far greater than any other Idumæan could ever boast of. His father, Antipater, though an Idumæan, was a person of such trust and esteem, among the Jews, that he held the greatest offices under their kings.

He served under their king Alexander as *governor of Idumæa*; (Antiq. book xiv. chap. 2. p. 469.) — under their king and high-priest Hyrcanus, as *governor of Judæa itself, and commander in chief of the Jewish army*. And afterwards he served under Cæsar, also, as *procurator of Judæa*. See the xivth and xvth chapters of the same book.

Therefore, not only as an Idumæan, but also by these continual connections, as well

well as residence among the Jews, Antipater seemed to be entirely naturalized to this people; insomuch that he esteemed their interest as his own; their country as though it had been *his native land*! His assiduity and diligence in repairing the walls of Jerusalem, (ἀνεγειρεῖ μὲν εὐθύς τὸ τεῖχος, book xiv. chap. 18.) when he had obtained leave of Cæsar to do so, is a proof of this, as well as Josephus's manner of expressing that circumstance, *Jewish War*, book i. chap. 8. viz. καὶ προσ-
 ἐπιβύχῃ τὰ τεῖχη τῆς πατρίδος ἀνακλίσαι καλεσθῆναι. Thus rendered by Rufinus:
 — “ et præter hoc (Antipater) impetra-
 “ vit, ut subversa patriæ mœnia renovare
 “ sibi liceret.” And again, Ἀντιπάτρος δὲ
 Καίσαρα προπεμπὼς ἐκ τῆς Συρίας, εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴν ὑπεσρέψεν, καὶ πρῶτον μὲν τὸ τεῖχος ἀνεδειμάλο τῆς πατρίδος ὑπὸ Πομπηίου καλεσθῆναι. Antipater vero, ubi de
 Syria Cæsarem profecutus est, in Judæam
 reversus,

reversus, *ante omnia PATRIÆ muros a*
Pompëio dirutos reparabat.

If all these circumstances are considered, it will not be easy to prove, that the *son* of such a person ought to be accounted a foreigner to the Jews. Herod was born a subject of the kingdom of the Jews, and publicly professed their religion, laws, and customs; notwithstanding that he frequently offended against them all: and, if he did not think himself, in reality, entitled to be esteemed one of that nation, he nevertheless omitted no proper opportunity of claiming relationship. A remarkable instance of this we have in his speech to the Jews, when he proposed to enlarge and beautify their temple. “ For (said he) *our fathers* “ built this temple to Almighty God after the return from Babylon,” Ἐπεὶ
τον γὰρ ναὸν τῆτον ἀποδομησαν μεν τῷ μεγίστῳ θεῷ ΠΑΤΕΡΕΣ ἩΜΕΤΕΡΟΙ, μετὰ
την

την εκ Βαβυλωνος αναβαιν. Jewish Antiq.
book xv. chap. 14. p. 543.

There are many other instances, in Josephus, of Herod's expressing himself in this manner : and indeed the singular circumstances of this monarch's connections with the Jews rendered his claim of relationship so just that it could not be disputed, although he was not descended of any of the twelve tribes. Josephus, who called Herod's father (Antipater) *an Idumæan*, does not deny that he was a Jew, but only that he *was not descended from the chief Jews, who came into Judæa from Babylon*, which had been asserted by Nicholas of Damascus. Antiq. book xiv. chap. 2. p. 469. On the contrary, Josephus informs us, that, when the Jews of Cæsarea contended with the Syrians for the right of superiority in that city, they alledged that the founder, *Herod their king, was a Jew by birth*: οἱ μὲν γὰρ Ἰε-
δαίοι

δαιοι πρῶτευειν ἡξιοῦν, δια τον κλισην της Και-
σαρειας Ἡρωδην αὐτων βασιλεα γεγονεναι το
γεν^Θ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟΝ. Antiq. book xx.
chap. 6. p. 695. And the justice of this
plea, so far as it related to Herod, *was al-*
lowed by the Syrians. Συροι δε τα μεν περι
τον Ἡρωδην ὡμολογεν, *Ἔς.* See also Jewish
War, book ii. chap. 12, p. 797. οἱ (Ισ-
δαιοι) μεν γαρ ἡξικεν σφετεραν ειναι την πολιν,
ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟΝ γεγονεναι τον κλισην αὐτης λε-
γοντες, ην δε Ἡρωδης, ὁ βασιλευς· οἱ δε ἑτεροι
(Συροι) τον οικισην μεν προσωμολογεν ΙΟΥ-
ΔΑΙΟΝ, *Ἔς.*

If all these things be considered, I think
they must justify my expression, that He-
rod had as much right to be esteemed a
Jew as the *Asmonæan princes of the tribe*
of Levi: and, though neither the latter
nor Herod (notwithstanding that *they were*
Jews) were really descended of the tribe
of Judah, yet the completion of Jacob's
prophecy, concerning the sceptre of Ju-
PART IV. U dah,

dah, is not at all affected by this circumstance.

For the said prophecy does not (I apprehend) so much relate to the descent or genealogy of the individuals, that were to rule in Judah, as to the particular pre-eminence of that whole tribe, from which the sceptre (the sign of its being a distinct kingdom) should not depart till Shiloh was come. Therefore, it is not so very material to my present purpose whether Herod was a Jew or not, since it must be acknowledged, (be his parentage what it will,) that he was nevertheless “*king of*” “*Judæa*,” as Luke styles him, chap. i. verse 5. *viz.* king of the *tribe and inheritance of Judah*, (as well as of the other tribes incorporated therein,) and that he kept his royal residence in *the capital city of that ruling tribe*, as did all the preceding kings of *Judah*, howsoever descended.

An

An objection has been made to the common interpretation of the word שֹׁבַט or *scepter*, in Jacob's prophecy; viz. that "it could not, with any sort of propriety, be said, that *the scepter should not depart from Judah*, when Judah had no scepter, nor was to have any for many generations afterwards." (5) But the learned author of this objection has not considered that the sceptre, or regal government in Judah, is plainly *implied and foretold in the former part of the same prophecy*, which entirely removes the force of his argument in favour of a different interpretation of that word. "*Judah*, (said the patriarch,) "*thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise;*" (alluding to the meaning of his name;) "*thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies;*" "*thy father's children shall bow down before thee.*" Gen. xlix. 8.

U 2

Now,

(5) See bishop Newton on the Prophecies, vol. i. p. 95.

Now, notwithstanding the precedency of the tribe of Judah, in the encampments and marching of the Israelites in the wilderness, yet this part of the prophecy, “ *thy father’s children shall bow down before thee,*” cannot be said to be fulfilled until all the other tribes became subject to the monarchy of the tribe of Judah under David and Solomon ; which is observed likewise by the authors of the Commentary on the Bible, called Assemblies Annotations. “ This” (say they) “ was literally most verified in David and Solomon, who were of this tribe ; and “ spiritually in Christ, the *lion of the tribe of Judah*, Rev. v. 5. to whom all “ knees shall bow.” Phil. ii. 10.— And they observe, farther, that “ the courage of Judah is compared to a lion’s whelp : “ such was the tribe of Judah in the first “ essays of war, in the time of Joshua ; “ afterwards it increased to the vigour of

“ a

“ a lion at full age, and old in comparison
 “ of a whelp : such it was in David’s
 “ time; and, by age and experience, sub-
 “ tle as well as strong; for David, of that
 “ tribe, was so wise that Saul was afraid
 “ of his wisdom, (1 Sam. xviii. 5. 14.
 “ 15.) and very courageous, (see 1 Sam.
 “ xvii. from ver. 32 to 51.) as the lion
 “ above other beasts, who, by his cou-
 “ rage and strength, *is a king over them.*”
 Num. xxiii. 24. Prov. xxviii. 1. and xxx.
 30. Amos iii. 8. Mic. v. 8.

If all this be considered, it will appear
 that שבט, in this text, must be translated
a scepter ; which is the opinion likewise
 of Monf. Martin : — “ Quoique le mot
 “ Hebreu signifie aussi une verge, et qu’il
 “ soit employé quelquefois dans un sens
 “ métaphorique pour la verge des afflic-
 “ tions, *la liaison de ce verset avec le pré-*
 “ *cédent, et toute la matiere contenue dans*
 “ *ce texte, ne permettent pas d’expliquer*
 “ ici

- “ ici ce mot autrement que par celui de
- “ *sceptre* ; de même que dans ce passage
- “ de Zacharie, chap. x. 11. où se trou-
- “ vent en Hebreu les mêmes termes
- “ qu’ici : le sceptre se départira d’Egypte.”

Thus it is plain that the *regal scepter* was not to depart from the tribe of *Judah* till *Shiloh* was come.

Now, the *Messiah* was not born until the close of *king Herod’s* reign, therefore the *scepter of Judah* could not be said to depart, or begin to depart, (“ *be departing,*” as some commentators have fancied,) before that period. Neither could *the land which Abaz vexed* be said to “ *be forsaken of both her kings,*” or monarchies, whilst *Herod* continued to reign in *Jerusalem*. But, *immediately after his death*, the form of government was entirely altered. There was no longer a *scepter* in the tribe or inheritance of *Judah!*

dah! The Jews had now no other *worldly king but Cæsar*; for the *peculiar scepter of Judah* was departed. They were, indeed, subject *to a scepter*, but it was the *Roman scepter*; which could not on this account be called the *scepter of Judah*; and therefore it is plain, that, at this time, the scepter departed from Judah. A solemn legation of fifty ambassadors, from Jerusalem, (who were backed by eight thousand Jews at Rome,) solicited Cæsar that their regal government might be changed, and that they might be added to the province of Syria, and become subject to the Roman commanders that should be sent there.—Ην δε κεφαλαιον αυλοις της αξιωσεως, βασιλειας και τοιων δε αρχων απηλλαχθαι, προσθηκην δε Συριας γεγονόας υπολασσεσθαι τοις εκεισε πεμπομενοις στρατηγοις. See Antiq. p. 611, 612. See also p. 781, 782. where the same thing is strongly expressed.

Ne-

Nevertheless, Cæsar did not, at that time, entirely comply with their request; for, as Archelaus was named by his father Herod to be his successor in the kingdom, Cæsar was pleased to grant him the half of Herod's dominions, but *not as a kingdom*, for he allowed him the title only of Ethnarch; and, as such, Archelaus had no more right to the *ensign of royalty*, spoken of by the patriarch Jacob in the 49th chapter of Genesis, than he had to the *title and dignity of a king*, which were *never conferred* on him, though promised conditionally.

Καισαρ δε ακεσας διαλυει μεν το συνεδριον, ολιγων δε ημερων υστερον Αρχελαον ΒΑΣΙΛΕΑ ΜΕΝ ΟΥΚ ΑΠΟΦΑΙΝΕΤΑΙ, του δε ημισε^ς της χωρας ηπερ Ἡρωδη υπελελει εθναρχην καθισαται, ΤΙΜΗΣΕΙΝ ΑΞΙΩΜΑΤΙ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑΣ ὙΠΙΣΧΝΟΤΜΕΝΟΣ ειπερ την εις αυτην αρετην προσφεροιτο. Antiq. book xvii.

xvii. chap. 13. p. 611. — From this it appears, that an ethnarch did not differ from a king *in title only*.

“ *The dignity of a kingdom*” was then merely promised; which is a proof that the ethnarchy, at that time established, was entirely without *such dignity*: and Archelaus was so far from obtaining the *promised kingdom*, that about nine years afterwards he *was banished even from his ethnarchy*. See Jewish War, book ii. chap. 6. p. 784. (6)

In the mean time Herod Antipas, another son of Herod the Great, was tetrarch of Galilee. It was this Herod who beheaded John the Baptist in his territory of Galilee, and whose crafty, base, and

PART IV. X self-

(6) Παραλαβὼν δὲ τὴν ἐθναρχίαν Ἀρχελαῖος, καὶ κατὰ μνήμην τῶν παλαιῶν διαφορῶν, οὐ μόνον Ἰουδαίοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ Σαμαρεῦσι χρησάμενος ὡμῶς, πρεσβευσαμένων ἐκατέρων κατ' αὐτοῦ πρὸς Καίσαρα, εἰτε τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐνθάδε φυλάσσεται μὲν εἰς Βιενναν, πόλιν τῆς Γαλατίας, αὐτῷ, &c.

self-interested, disposition was characterized by the Messiah himself under the simile of a *fox*: for in detestation of such *pernicious principles* he even named him from that wily animal. “Go and tell *that fox*,” &c. To this man was Christ sent by Pontius Pilate; not because Herod Antipas had any judicial authority in Jerusalem, but because Christ was accounted a *Galilean*, and therefore Pilate sent him, as being one that belonged unto *Herod’s jurisdiction*. See St. Luke xxiii. 6, 7. (7)

Judæa was, indeed, *spiritually the kingdom of the Messiah*, of which many incontestable proofs are inserted throughout this work, and compared with the predictions of the prophets; but, with respect

(7) —“when Pilate heard of *Galilee*, he asked whether the man (Jesus) were a *Galilean*. And, as soon as he knew that he belonged unto *Herod’s jurisdiction*, he sent him to *Herod*, who himself was also at Jerusalem at that time.”

respect to its temporal or civil government, it was so far from *being a kingdom* at this time, that it was only considered as a part of the province of Syria; and for above thirty years together was governed by a regular succession of Roman procurators, (8) until Herod Agrippa obtained Judæa and Samaria (in addition to his former dominions) of the emperor Claudius, who likewise confirmed his *title of king*. This, at first sight, seems a weighty objection to the explanation, which I have offered, concerning the completion of Jacob's prophecy: but, if we consider all the circumstances of this reign, perhaps it will appear otherwise. Though Agrippa enjoyed the title, pomp, and appearance, of a king,

X 2

he

(8) Josephus informs us, that Valerius Gratus, successor to Annius Rufus, was the fifth governor of the Jews; and that he was succeeded by Pontius Pilate—

“ και περιεπιθευεν αυτου παρεν Ιουδαιοις επαρχου, διαδοχου
 “ Αννιου Ρουφου, Ουαλιξιου Γρατου.”—Ποντιου δε Πιλατου
 διαδοχου αυτου ηκεν. Antiq. book xviii. chap. 3. p. 619.

he was nevertheless subjected in no small degree (as well as his predecessors the Roman procurators) to the controul of the Roman president of Syria. (9)—For, when he had undertaken thoroughly to repair and complete the fortifications of Jerufalem, Marfus, the president of Syria, had a watchful eye over him, and signified his distrust to Cæsar, who caused him to desist. Antiq. book xix. chap. 7. p. 677.—And afterwards Marfus exerted his authority as president in a very remarkable manner, even *in the dominions of Agrippa, when the king himself was resident therein*; for, being jealous of the friendship and unity between Agrippa and several of the neighbouring potentates, who were come to visit him at Tiberias, *he sent and commanded them all to depart to their respective governments, which was a matter of the greatest mortification to*

(9) Antiq. book xviii. chap. 15. p. 615. Της δὲ Ἀρχέλαου χάρις ὑποταλούς προσνηθείσης τῇ Συρίᾳ, &c.

to Agrippa.—Εὐθὺς οὖν ἐκασὼ τῶν ἐπι-
 δειῶν τινὰς πεμπῶν ἐπέσελλεν ἐπὶ τὰ ἑαυτοῦ
 διχα μελλήσεως ἀπερχεσθαι. ταῦτα Ἀγριπ-
 πας ἀνιάρως ἐξεδέχετο καὶ Μαρσῶ μὲν ἐκ τῶν
 διαφορῶς εἶχε. Antiq. book xix. chap. 7.
 p. 678.

These are proofs that Agrippa's power as a king was very much circumscribed in comparison with that of Herod the Great. Herod was so far from being subject to the controul of the presidents of Syria, that he himself was made president of *all Syria* by Cæsar ; (κατέστησε δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ΣΥΡΙΑΣ ὍΛΗΣ ΕΠΙΤΡΟΠΟΝ·) who directed the several governors to do nothing without his counsel and advice. Ὡς μηδὲν ἐξεῖναι, διχα τῆς ἐκείνου συμβουλίας, τοῖς ἐπιτροποῖς διοικεῖν. Jewish War, book i. chap. xv. p. 746. See also Antiq. book xv. chap. 13. p. 541.

On the other hand, likewise, the reign of Agrippa was so very short, in comparison

son of the time that the sceptre had been departed Judah, that, I think, it can scarcely be considered as an exception either to the prophecy of Jacob, or to this of Isaiah, concerning *the two kings*; especially as Agrippa was cut off from his kingdom by a very remarkable interposition of Divine Providence: for, after he had slain St. James, (the brother of St. John,) imprisoned St. Peter, and otherwise grievously persecuted the Christians, he fulfilled the measure of his iniquity by accepting the idolatrous flattery of the people at Cæsarea; “ *and immediately*
“ *the angel of the Lord smote him, because*
“ *he gave not God the glory: and he was*
“ *eaten up of worms, and gave up the*
“ *ghost;*” (Acts xii. 23.) having reigned over Judah only *three years*, according to Josephus, who, in the 19th book of his Antiquities, chap. 7. p. 679, confirms the account given by St. Luke, though in some particulars his relation is different.

ent. Τελευτησας εν Καισαρεια, βασι-
 λευκως μεν ΕΤΗ ΤΡΙΑ, προτερον δε των
 τετραρχιων τρισιν ετεροις ετεσιν αφηγησαμε-
 ν@, &c. Jewish War, book ii. chap. 19.
 P. 793.

Immediately after his death, (his son, Agrippa the younger, being only an infant,) the kingdom was reduced again into a province, (10) and never was any more restored; for the government of the Roman procurators (which had been only interrupted by this shadow of a reign after eight or nine persons had been invested with that dignity) was once more established and continued during a regular succession of seven other procurators, until the time of the general revolt of the Jews, when the just and dreadful vengeance of God was ready to

(10) 'Υιον δε εκ της αυτης (Cypros) Αγριππαν, ου
 παλαιασι εν ηγησει, παλιν τας βασιλειας Κλαυδιου
 επαρχιαν ποιησας επιροπον πεμπει Κεσπιον Φαδον, επει τα
 Τιβεριον Αλεξανδρον, &c. Jewish War, book ii. chap. 19.
 P. 793.

to overtake them for their wickedness and unbelief, according to the express prediction of Christ recorded in the Gospels. Matt. xxiv. Mark xiii. Luke xxi.

Agrippa the younger afterwards obtained the kingdom of Chalcis, (11) and some other dominions ; but he never had any authority at Jerusalem, except that ecclesiastical authority over the temple and priests, which his uncle and predecessor, Herod king of Chalcis, had enjoyed before him ; for all Judæa (except two (12) cities in Peræa, and two (13) in Galilee, given to Agrippa) were governed by Felix, the Roman procurator. “ Εἰς
 “ ΔΕ ΤΗΝ ΛΟΙΠΗΝ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΑΝ, Φηλικά
 “ ΚΑΤΕΣΗΣΕΝ ΕΠΙΤΡΟΠΟΝ.” Jewish War, book ii. chap. 22. p. 796. Thus it appears,

(11) Antiq. book xx. chap. 3. p. 690. Jewish War, book ii. chap. 20. p. 794. chap. 22. p. 796.

(12) Abila and Julias.

(13) Tarichæa and Tiberias.

pears, *that Jerusalem* had ceased to be the seat of *regal government*, from the time of Herod's death to the total destruction of that city; except indeed during the three years reign of Herod Agrippa. But it is remarkable, that before this short reign the Jews had not only solicited Cæsar by a solemn legation of fifty ambassadors, (as I have before observed in page 159.) that their nation might no longer be governed by kings, but their chief priests had likewise publicly abrogated all pretensions their nation could have to *any peculiar sceptre* of their own: for, when Pilate brought forth Jesus in the presence of the main body of the people, who were assembled at Jerusalem on account of the passover, and said, "*Behold your king;*" and again, "*Shall I crucify your king?*" they answered,—We have *no other king but Cæsar*. St. John xix. 14, 15.

This public acknowledgement of the Jews, that the *peculiar Sceptre of Judah* was then no more; the *limited jurisdiction* as well as *brevity* (14) of Herod Agrippa's reign; and the want of *regal succession* for a long time before it, and *for ever* after it; are reasons, which, I hope, will justify my suggestion, that the said reign is not to be considered as a continuation

(14) Josephus, in some parts of his history, expresses a very particular respect (if it may not be called a partiality) in favour of the character of Agrippa, on account of his zealous attachment to Judaism. Nevertheless, the *limited jurisdiction and brevity of his reign* were such, that even Josephus himself did not consider it as a *continuation of the regal government of Judah*; for, in the 8th chapter of his 20th book of his Antiquities, where he gives a summary account of the government at Jerusalem, under which the office of high priest subsisted from the time of Herod the Great to the destruction of Jerusalem, he observes, that, *after the death of Herod and Archelaus, the government (or police) was an aristocracy*; and he entirely omits any mention of Agrippa's reign in this place; so that, it is plain, he did not think it properly an exception to his observation. *Μέλα δὲ τὴν τῶν τελευτῶν, ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ μὲν ἦν ἡ πολιτεία, τὴν δὲ προφασίαν τοῦ εἶναι οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς πεπιστεύησαν.* Antiq. book xx. chap. 8. p. 702.

tinuation of the sceptre in Judah : and therefore it is most natural to conclude, that the same really departed at *the death of Herod the Great* ; which period corresponds more exactly to the time pointed out by Jacob's prophecy than any other. Shiloh, *the Prince of Peace*, was then come ; and Herod (convinced, by “ *the wise men from the east*,” that a child *was born king of the Jews*) had attempted in vain to cut him off at Bethlehem ; (15)

Y 2

for,

(15) The general consent of the chief priests and scribes of the Jews, concerning the place of the Messiah's birth, is very remarkable ; for, when Herod gathered them together, “ he demanded of them where Christ “ should be born ? and they said unto him, in Bethlehem “ of Judæa : ” for thus it is written by the prophet ; “ And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, art not “ the least among the princes of Judah : for out of “ thee shall come a governor that shall rule my people “ Israel.” Mat. ii. 4-6. Now, though the Jews still deny that our Lord Jesus was the Christ, yet they must confess, *with their ancestors*, that the true Messiah, according to the prophet Micah, (v. 2) ought to be born at Bethlehem. It is, therefore, a matter of the highest importance to them, to consider what expectations they can reasonably have, now-a-days, of the birth

for, like the generality of the Jews, Herod expected a temporal prince; and therefore concluded, that his own sceptre and authority was in danger, as it really was, it being *then about to depart*. For, very soon afterwards, Joseph, the husband of the blessed Virgin, was warned by an angel of the Lord in Egypt, saying,

“ Arise,

birth of a Messiah *of the seed of David* at Bethlehem, since that place for so many ages has ceased *to be the city of David*? For, instead of the family and kindred of David, it is now inhabited by “ *Turks, Moors, Arabians, and some poor Christians.*” See *Bobun’s Geographical Dictionary*, printed in 1695.—And farther, if any person hereafter born at Bethlehem should pretend to be *the son of David*, (or of the seed of David,) the Jews ought to consider, whether it is now possible to trace that *royal line* down to the present time in so satisfactory a manner, that they might *safely* and *reasonably* give cred it to such pretensions. “ But what is “ Bethlehem now? Where are the thousands of Judah, “ of which this was one? What is Jerusalem now? “ Are the tribes preserved? Has *Judah* still the sceptre and the lawgiver? Where is its ensign displayed? “ And *who can now prove their descent from David*? All “ the signs” (כלו כל הקצין Gem. Sanhedrin. c ii. §. 31.) “ of the coming of the Messiah are past,” &c. Dr. Gregory Sharpe’s *2d Argument in Defence of Christianity*, p. 146. Oh that the *house of Israel* may consider these things before it is too late!

“ Arise, and take the *young child* and his
 “ mother, and go into *the land of Israel,*”
 (*not the land of Judah only:*) “ for they
 “ are dead which sought the *young child’s*
 “ life.” Matth. ii. 20.

Perhaps some critic may object, that, as Christ was undoubtedly *king of Israel and Judah*, the sceptre of Judah cannot be said to depart at the death of Herod, according to the interpretation just now given of the patriarch Jacob’s prophecy: therefore it is necessary for me to observe, that the *sceptre*, spoken of in this prophecy, and the ceasing of the two kings or regal governments, spoken of by Isaiah, can only be understood to mean the departure of the *worldly sceptre* and *temporal regal authority* from Judah and Israel, as necessarily to be distinguished from the *spiritual authority* and *heavenly kingdom* of Christ; for, as Christ was “ *born king of the Jews,*” so the sceptre of Judah,
 with

with respect to him, is not departed, but is everlasting, according to the prophecy of the Royal Psalmist concerning Christ's kingdom. "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." Psalm xlv. 6, 7.

The other part of Jacob's prophecy concerning Judah, (viz. "*nor a lawgiver from between his feet,*") does not relate (I apprehend) to the sceptre or regal government of Judah; for the particle *et* (rendered "*nor*" in the common English version, which divides these words from the former part of the sentence) seems to point out, that two distinct things are here spoken of, as Mons. Martin has observed: "*Car cette particule, et, marque que c'étoient deux choses différentes,*"

“*férentes, le sceptre et le légiflateur.*” But, as the accomplishment of prophecies is always the best interpreter, I have been chiefly confirmed in this opinion of Mons. Martin, by observing, that the departure of the lawgiver from Judah was not less remarkable, in the accomplishment, than that of the sceptre ; for the prophecies concerning both seem plainly to have been accomplished in two different persons.

The word *מחוקק* must be understood in a very inferior sense from the usual acceptation, if the Jewish Sanhedrin, or the Scribes and Pharisees, are to be esteemed lawgivers, as some have imagined.

The Lord himself is called by Isaiah *מחוקקנו* “*our lawgiver ;*” xxxiii. 22. And, as it pleased Almighty God to declare his will to his people Israel, by Moses and the Prophets, they also are intitled

intituled to the name of *lawgivers*, as being the immediate instruments of God's revelation. Judah might likewise be properly called *a lawgiver*, (Psalms lx. 7. cviii. 8.) because *the Messiah* was to be born of that tribe. But the Scribes and Pharisees, or the Sanhedrin, were not sent by God with any farther revelation than what had before been given by Moses and the Prophets; and therefore, though they sat in Moses' seat, (Matt. xxiii. 2.) yet they could not properly be called lawgivers; being only *lawyers*, or *expounders* of the law of Moses: and, if no person among the Jews for above seventeen hundred years has had a better claim to the title of lawgiver than these, it must plainly appear that the lawgiver (as well as the sceptre) is departed from Judah; and, consequently, that the Messiah came before that time. Malachi is the last person whom the Jews acknowledge as a prophet in their canon of the Scriptures;
and

and it is remarkable that Almighty God was pleased to comfort them by this holy messenger (מלאכי) with the promise of another messenger or prophet. “Be-

“hold, I will send you *Elijah, the prophet*, before the coming of the “great and dreadful day of the Lord,”

Mal. iv. 5. This dreadful visitation of their nation was certainly accomplished in the destruction of Jerusalem; for, if we examine the histories of former times ever so minutely, we shall not be able to find any *national afflictions or miseries* whatsoever to be compared with those which the Jews suffered at that time.

This ought to be a sufficient proof to the Jews of the truth of Christ's prophecy concerning themselves, recorded in Matthew xxiv. 15, 21. (16) Luke xxi.

PART IV. Z 20,

(16) “When ye therefore shall see the *abomination* “of desolation spoken of by Daniel, the Prophet, “(ix. 27. and xii. 11.) stand in the holy place, “(who so readeth, let him understand,) then let them “which

20, 21, 22, 23, 24 (17) and Mark xiii. 19. so that, as one part of the prophecy was, so punctually accomplished, they may safely assure themselves that such great tribulation

“ which be in Judæa flee unto the mountains.”—“ For
 “ then shall be *great tribulation*, such as was not since
 “ the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor
 “ ever shall be. — And, except those days should be
 “ shortened, there should no flesh be saved : but for
 “ the elects sake those days shall be shortened.”

(17) “ And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed
 “ with armies, then know that the desolation thereof
 “ is nigh. Then let them which are in Judæa flee
 “ to the mountains ; and let them, which are in the
 “ midst of it, depart out ; and let not them that are
 “ in the countries enter thereinto. For these be the
 “ *days of vengeance*, that all things which are written”
 (Dan. ix. 26, 27. Zech. xi. 1. &c. &c.) “ may be
 “ fulfilled. But woe unto them that are with child,
 “ and to them that give suck in those days : for there
 “ shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon
 “ *this people*. And they shall fall by the edge of the
 “ sword, and shall be led away captive into all na-
 “ tions : and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the
 “ Gentiles, *until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.*”
 Luke xxi. 20-24. “ For in those days shall be af-
 “ fliction, such as was not from the beginning of the
 “ creation, which God created, unto this time, nei-
 “ ther shall be.” Mark xiii. 19.

tribulation will never befall them again, according to Christ's promise in the same prophecy.

Compare the said prophecy with that of Daniel ix. 26, 27.

But, though this great and dreadful day of the Lord is certainly past, yet the Jews do not allow that the promised Elijah is yet come. Nevertheless they sent Priests and Levites from Jerusalem to enquire of John the Baptist.—“ Who art thou?—Art thou Elias?” and he saith, I am not. “ Art thou that prophet?” (meaning most likely that prophet promised by Moses in Deut. xviii. 15th and 18th verses, who was afterwards acknowledged by about five thousand Jews at one time; for so many were joint witnesses of one of his miracles, being convinced by all their senses, of

seeing, hearing, and tasting,) and he answered *no*.

But, notwithstanding that John was a different person from Elijah the prophet, according to his own confession, yet he was most certainly the prophet promised by *Malachi* under the prophetical appellation of *Elijah*, which denoted the excellency of his spiritual mission; for the angel Gabriel told his father Zacharias in the temple, that John should go before the Lord in the “*spirit and power of Elias*.” See St. Luke i. 17. And afterwards Christ himself bore witness of him:—“if ye
“will receive it, *this is Elias* (18) *which*
“*was for to come* ;” (Matt. xi. 14.) and in the same chapter he calls him “a prophet, yea, and more than a prophet;” he being the Lord’s messenger promised by *Malachi* iii. 1. to prepare his way before him.

John

(18) See also Matthew xvii. 10-13.

John was likewise a lawgiver (πρωτοβουλος) as well as a prophet and messenger; for “there went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan.” Matt. iii. 5. And, when he warned them to flee from the wrath to come, “the people asked him, saying, what shall we do then?” (Luke iii. 10.) and we find by the succeeding verses that he instructed them accordingly, not only with general doctrine, but even with particular advice, suitable to the different classes of men. These testimonies of the Evangelists in favour of John are confirmed in no small degree even by the Jewish historian Josephus, who calls him “αγαθον ανδρα, a good man :”—for indeed his life and conversation were so exemplary and unblameable, that many of the Jews (as Josephus informs us) believed the destruction of Herod’s army to be a just judgement of God for the murder of that

that good man. (19) See Jewish Antiq.
book xviii. c. 7.

John was not, indeed, of the tribe of
Judah, yet it cannot be denied but that
he was a *Jew*, according to what has
been before observed concerning the
Asmonæan princes and “*Herod the*
“*king of Judea:*” (Luke i. 5.) and
he might very well be accounted a *law-*
“*giver*

(19) “Of whom Josephus, in the place above
“quoted, gives us the following character: that his
“whole crime was his exhorting the Jews to the love
“and practice of virtue; and, first of all, to piety,
“justice, and regeneration, or newness of life; not by
“the bare abstinence from this or that particular sin,
“but by an habitual purity of mind and body.”

“Now” (continues he) “so great was the credit
“and authority of this holy man, as appears by the
“multitude of his disciples, and the veneration they
“had for his doctrine, (for he could do what he would
“with them,) that Herod, not knowing how far the
“reputation of a man of his spirit might influence the
“people toward a revolt, resolved at length to take
“him off before it was too late,” &c. He adds, “that
“Herod was very unsuccessful in his war with the
“Arabian king; all which the Jews looked upon as a
“just judgement of God upon him for that impious
“murder.” *Univ. Hist. vol. x. p. 538.*

giver from between the feet of Judah, for he was born in the hill-country of Judaea, (Luke i. 65.) in a city of Juda, (Luke i. 39.) at a time when that tribe was in full possession of its inheritance.

But the circumstance which more particularly points out the accomplishment of of Jacob's prophecy in this holy Nazarite (20) is, that John was the very last of the Jewish lawgivers or prophets. For though, on extraordinary occasions, some prophetic sentences may have been uttered by men adhering to Judaism, after the coming of Christ, (such as the remarkable prophecy of Caiaphas, the high-priest, concerning Christ,—“that it was expedient

(20) John was a “Nazarite unto God from his mother's womb,” as Sampson, one of the judges of Israel, had been before him. (Compare Judges xvi. 17. with St. Luke i. 15.) But Christ could not properly be called a Nazarite (as Dr. Williams supposes him to be) without a contradiction to the usual sense of that title in the Jewish law.

“ expedient that one man should die for
 “ the people,” &c. John xi. 50.) (21)
 yet the Jews cannot prove that a single
 prophet (professedly as such) has been
 sent to them from God ever since the
 time of John; that is, for above 1700
 years; except they will condescend to
 allow to St. Paul, Agabus, and others
 of the primitive Christians, the title of
 prophets: but these were under the dis-
 pensation of the New Testament, after
 the ceremonial and typical law was an-
 nulled,

(21) See what a manifest (though unwilling) testi-
 mony, even *the unbelieving Jews* bare of Christ's hea-
 venly mission.—“ Then gathered the chief priests and
 “ Pharisees a council, and said, *What do we? for this*
 “ *man doeth many miracles. If we thus let him alone, all*
 “ *men will believe on him; and the Romans shall come*
 “ *and take away both our place and nation.* And one of
 “ them, named Caiaphas, being *the high-priest* that same
 “ year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all, nor
 “ consider that it is expedient for us, *that one man should*
 “ *die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not.*
 “ And this spake he not of himself: but, being high-
 “ priest that year, *he prophesied* that Jesus should die
 “ for that nation,” &c. John xi. 47-51.

nulled, and therefore cannot be reckoned among the *Jewish* lawgivers or prophets.

This was confirmed by Christ himself, (Luke xvi. 16.) “ the *law* and “ the *prophets* were until *John*.”—And again, (Matth. xi. 12, 13.) “ for all “ the *prophets* and the *law* prophesied “ until *John*.”

These are sufficient authorities, I hope, to justify my supposition, that the *prophet* and *lawgiver* departed from *Judah* at the death of John the Baptist; or rather, was gradually departing for some time before his death: because, as *Christ* increased, *John* decreased, according to his own prophecy, recorded by John the Evangelist, (iii. 30.) “ Ye “ yourselves bear me witness, that I “ said, *I am not the Christ*, but that I “ am sent before him. He that hath “ the bride” (that is, *the church*, or con-

PART IV. A a gregation;

gregation; for John had just before been told that Christ "*baptizeth*, and "*a'l men come to him*," 26th verse)
 " is the bridegroom: but, the friend
 " of the bridegroom, which standeth
 " and heareth him, rejoiceth greatly
 " because of the bridegroom's voice:
 " this my joy is therefore fulfilled. He
 " *must increase*, but I *must decrease*. (22)
 " He that cometh from above is above
 " all: he that is of the earth is earth-
 " ly, and speaketh of the earth: he
 " that cometh from heaven is above
 " all. And what he hath seen and
 " heard, that he testifieth; and no
 " man receiveth his testimony. He
 " that hath received his testimony hath
 " set to his seal, that God is true. For
 " he whom God hath sent speaketh
 " the

(22) " When therefore the Lord knew how the
 " Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized
 " *more disciples* than John, (though Jesus himself bap-
 " tized not, but his disciples,) he left Judea, and de-
 " parted again into Galilee." John iv. 1, 2, 3.

“ the words of God : for God giveth
 “ not the Spirit by measure (*unto him.*)
 “ The Father loveth the Son, and hath
 “ given all things into his hand. He
 “ that believeth on the Son hath ever-
 “ lasting life : and he that believeth
 “ not the Son shall not see life ; but
 “ the wrath of God abideth on him.”

Thus far the Evangelist seems to be relating the testimony of John, the second Elias.

In the 5th chapter (31st verse) of
 the same Evangelist, we read, that this
 remarkable testimony was afterwards re-
 ferred to by Christ himself. “ If I bear
 “ witness of myself, (said Christ,) my
 “ witness is not true. *There is another*
 “ that beareth witness of me, and I
 “ know that the witness, which he wit-
 “ nesseth of me, is true. *Ye sent unto*
 “ *John*, and he bare witness unto the
 A a 2 “ truth.

“ truth. But I receive *not testimony from man* :”—nevertheless, our Lord condescended to give the Jews an opportunity of being convinced by *the testimony of man* ; a man, whom they almost universally esteemed on account of the purity of his life, which I have already shewn from the authority even of the *Jewish* historian, Josephus.

The mercy of God, therefore, is apparent in this condescension ; and, though our Lord himself declared, that he received not “ *testimony from man*,” yet he added,—“ *but these things*” (relating to John’s testimony) “ *I say, that ye might be saved.*”

He then gives a most lively and comprehensive (though short) description of the holy character of this his harbinger. “ *He was*” (says our Lord) “ *a burning and a shining light* ;”—and he reminds the Jews, that they formerly testified a
 very

very particular approbation of this holy person : “ *and ye were willing*” (says he)
 “ for a season *to rejoice in his light.*
 “ But I have greater witness than that
 “ of *John* : for *the works* which the Fa-
 “ ther hath given me to finish, the
 “ same works that I do, *bear witness*
 “ of me, that the Father hath sent me.
 “ *And the Father himself*, which hath sent
 “ me, hath borne witness of me. Ye have
 “ neither heard his voice at any time,
 “ nor seen his shape. And ye have not *his*
 “ *word* abiding in you : for, whom he
 “ hath sent, him ye believe not. *Search*
 “ *the Scriptures*, for in them ye think ye
 “ have eternal life, and they are they
 “ which testify of me.” Thus Christ
 pointed out to the Jews three incon-
 testible indications of the truth of his
 holy doctrine.

1st. The testimony of John the Bap-
 tist, with which he *indulged* them, though
 the

the same might be esteemed unnecessary for the cause of him, who “ *receives* “ *not testimony* from man.”

2dly. His own *mighty works*, daily wrought among them, which, as he said, “ *bear witness* of me, that the “ Father hath sent me.”

And 3dly. The *witness of the Father himself*, though (as Christ expressed himself to the Jews) “ ye have neither “ heard his voice at any time, nor seen “ his shape ;” but he seems plainly to direct them to that *witness of God*, which has in all ages been apparent in the accomplishment of the *word of the Lord by his prophets*.

Even the unbelieving Jews themselves pretended to believe *the Scriptures*, and acknowledged them to be *the word of God* ; and therefore Christ referred them
to

to the Scriptures, as being *the witness* of the Father himself. “*Search the Scriptures,*” &c. But they wilfully neglected to make a right use of such ample testimony; and were, therefore, inexcusable. “Do not think” (said Christ) “that I will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, *even Moses in whom ye trust.*” “For, had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But, if ye believe not *his writings,* how shall ye believe my words?”

In the very next chapter (vi. 1, 2.) the Evangelist relates the accomplishment of one of the circumstances of Jacob’s prophecy, as recorded by Moses; viz.—“*and unto him shall the gathering of the people be.*”

“After these things” (says St. John)
 “Jesus went over the sea of Galilee,
 “which

“ which is the sea of Tiberias, and
 “ A GREAT MULTITUDE FOLLOWED
 “ HIM, *because they saw his miracles,*”
 &c. And again, (14th and 15th
 verses,) “ then those men,” (the five
 thousand persons, who were fed by
 Christ with five barley loaves and two
 small fishes,) “ when they had seen the
 “ miracle that Jesus did, said, This is
 “ of a truth that prophet *that should*
 “ *come into* the world. When Jesus,
 “ therefore, perceived that they would
 “ come and *take him by force, to make*
 “ *him a king,*” (for they could not pos-
 sibly give him a greater proof of their
 sincerity in *gathering to him* as the true
 Shiloh,) “ he departed again into a
 “ mountain himself alone.”

The people of Israel (as Mr. Mann ob-
 serves in his learned treatise *de Anno*
Natali Christi, p. 4.) were not the only
 people that were to be gathered unto
 Shiloh;

Shiloh ; not one nation only is pointed at, in the prophecy, *but many nations*. The patriarch's words were not יקרה העם the gathering of *this people* or nation, but in the plural number יקרה עמים the gathering of *the nations* ; which has been apparently fulfilled : for, the nations have at different times almost universally submitted to the faith of our Lord Jesus, the true Shiloh ; notwithstanding that many have since fallen back into gross ignorance, superstition, and unbelief. (23) The *gathering of the people* to impostors does not at all affect the certainty of the

PART IV.

B b

sign

(23) We have a dreadful example of this in the present state of the once-enlightened Grecian empire, of the greatest part of Asia, and of almost the whole vast continent of Africa. Nay, the greatest part even of Europe itself hath long since resumed the veil of its former darkness, and the shadow of death : for, the superstitious vanities of Rome bear too great a resemblance to the old Heathen idolatries ; and the multitude of Atheists, Deists, and of those who neglect Christ's holy sacraments, is an alarming indication of a *falling off* even among ourselves.

sign given by the patriarch Jacob, in *the gathering of the people* to Shiloh.

Many false Christs have indeed appeared, according to our Lord's prediction in Matthew xxiv. 24. (24) Luke xxi. 8. (25) and to such the Jews have zealously *gathered* themselves: for, "they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God sent them *strong delusion*" (as foretold by St. Paul) "that they should believe a lie." 2 Theff. ii. 11.

The same people, who rejected *the truth* through *hardness of heart* and *want of*

(24) "For, there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders, infomuch that (if it were possible) they shall deceive the very elect. *Behold, I have told you before,*" &c.

(25) "Take heed that ye be not deceived; for, many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and the time draweth near: go ye not therefore after them,"

of faith, very soon afterwards, by a *contrary* infatuation, rendered themselves despicable by the most *absurd credulity*.

Even the Jewish historian, Josephus, gives ample testimony of the proneness of his countrymen to error and false doctrine, and that they were easily led away by impostors and deceivers. He relates a very remarkable instance of it, in their being led out by an Egyptian to the mount of Olives; from whence he had undertaken to shew them a wonderful spectacle, viz. that the walls of Jerusalem should fall at his command. (26)

The same spiritual blindness continued even after *the abomination of desolation*, notwithstanding the apparent judgment of God upon them, in the destruction of their great (and once holy)

B b 2 city :

city: for they have (as readily since that time as before) acknowledged the incredible pretensions of several impostors, who have at different times set themselves up for the true Messiah. For instance, the infamous Barchocheba, (ברכוכה or *Son of a Star*,) in the reign of the emperor Adrian, was gladly received, and zealously supported, among the Jews, until an immense slaughter of his miserable adherents plainly demonstrated that he was more properly intitled Barchozba, (ברכוזבא) *Son of a Lie*. The Jews were also notably deceived by SabbateiSevi, who wickedly took upon himself the character of the Messiah. But it is remarkable, that it was the Jews alone, and not *all the other nations of the world*, that were gathered to these counterfeits; which ought to demonstrate to the *present house of Israel* the apparent difference between the true Messiah, and the miserable deceivers above-mentioned.

Thus,

Thus, I hope, I have shewn, that the sceptre did not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, *until Shiloh was come*; and that *the gathering of the people* (not of one nation only but *of the universe* at different times) has been unto Christ himself, according to the Scriptures.

“ Bring forth the blind people that
 “ *have eyes*, and the *deaf* that *have*
 “ *ears*. Let *all the nations* be gathered
 “ *together*, and let the people be as-
 “ sembled: who among them can de-
 “ clare this, and shew us former things?
 “ Let them bring forth their witnesses,
 “ that they may be justified: or let
 “ *them hear*, and *say*, “ It is *Truth*.”
 Isaiah xliii. 8, 9.

“ Glory be to God in the highest, and
 “ and on earth peace, good-will towards
 “ men.”

The END of PART IV.

A N
A N S W E R

TO SOME OF THE
Principal Arguments used by Dr. W—MS
IN DEFENCE OF
HIS CRITICAL DISSERTATION

O N
ISAIAH vii. 13, 14, 15, 16, &c.

IN WHICH
The Opinions of the late Dr. SYKES and Dr.
GEORGE BENSON, concerning *Accommodations*
of Scripture Prophecy, are briefly considered.

P A R T V.

A N
A N S W E R
T O

Some of the principal Arguments used
by Dr. W——ms in Defence of his
Critical Dissertation on ISAIAH vii.
13, 14, 15, 16, &c.

I Have pointed out to Dr. W——ms several mistakes in his Critical Dissertation on Isaiah vii. 13, 14, 15, 16; yet he hath not thought proper to acknowledge one of them, though he has laboured to disprove several. Some of the principal arguments which the Doctor has advanced in favour of his hypothesis are considered in the following pages.

PART V.

C c

But,

But, before I proceed to a defence of my remarks, it may be necessary for me to examine a very important question concerning the interpretation of Scripture prophecies, notwithstanding that Dr. W——ms apprehends the same to be “ *sufficiently* and even *conclusively* “ *decided already* ;” viz. Whether any “ allegorical meanings and double senses “ of Scripture prophecies are to be allowed?

“ It is impossible (says the Doctor) to “ determine when any prophecy is fulfilled, if it has more than one single “ sense. If it has two (says he) it may “ have two hundred, and all of them “ equally just.”

For the confirmation of this sentiment, he refers me to Dr. George Benson’s preface to the first volume of his paraphrase

phrase and notes on St. Paul's Epistles, and to Dr. Sykes's Connexion of natural and revealed Religion, page 217, &c.

These I have examined with as much care, I believe, as is necessary, and find, that the third objection to Dr. George Benson's hypothesis, quoted even in his own Introduction, p. xxxiv. obliges him to make such large concessions concerning types and figures, that, notwithstanding his great zeal against double senses, his denying of them seems a mere disagreement in terms, and not in effect, from the general received opinion.

In his answer to the said objection, he allows, p. xxxv. " That, wherever the
 " *law* or the *Prophets* have declared,
 " that the rites and ceremonies of *the*
 " *Mosaic constitution* were intended to
 " point out a moral obligation, or
 " to prefigure the *Messiah*, or something
 C c 2 " in

“ in the Christian dispensation, there
 “ that moral intention, or prophetic
 “ prefiguration, is the one true sense
 “ of the text, &c.” See the Doctor’s
 answer at length, in p. xxxv.

Here he plainly allows of a direct application, in some cases, to the anti-type; which he calls “ *the one true sense of the text.*”—But how (as a reasonable man) he can possibly avoid acknowledging the necessary consequence of this his concession, I leave all candid readers to judge: for, if there is an allegorical sense alluding to the anti-type, (which he calls “ *a moral intention or prophetic prefiguration,*”) there must certainly be, likewise, a *literal sense applicable to the type itself.*

Indeed the Doctor has in that place refined his argument to so small a thread, that it becomes almost imperceptible.

The

The next objection, quoted by Dr. Benson, is as follows. — Object. IV.
 “ Are not many passages in the New
 “ Testament taken from the Old Testa-
 “ ment, and used in a quite different
 “ sense from what they have as they
 “ stand in the original writer? and
 “ must not these be called double senses
 “ of the words of sacred Scripture?”

To this the Doctor answers, — “ It
 “ is acknowledged, that our Lord, and
 “ his Apostles and Evangelists, have
 “ taken several passages from the Old
 “ Testament, and used them in a very
 “ different sense from what they have,
 “ as connected with the place from
 “ whence they were taken.

“ But that will not prove a double
 “ sense of the words. I may quote
 “ a passage from *Homer* or *Virgil*, He-
 “ *rodotus*

“ *rodotus* or *Livy*, to express my pre-
 “ sent meaning, and in quite another
 “ sense from what it has in those anti-
 “ ent authors : but that will not prove
 “ that those antient authors intended
 “ their words should be understood in
 “ two senses. In the original intention
 “ they had only one meaning. In *my*
 “ *accommodation of them*, they have only
 “ one meaning. And though the same
 “ words may have different ideas af-
 “ fixed to them; and be used, by suc-
 “ cessive speakers, or writers, in vari-
 “ ous senses; yet that does not prove .
 “ that, in the original intention, they
 “ had more than one signification.”

Now, I readily allow, that Dr. Ben-
 son’s idea of *an accommodation* is certainly
 true in such cases as he has supposed,
 viz. in quotations from *Homer* or *Vir-*
gil, &c. “ To express a present mean-
 “ ing in quite another sense from what
 “ it

“ it has in those antient authors.” And I as readily assent to a part of Dr. W——ms’s quotation in page 41 of his Critical Dissertation, from a very learned author, (1) viz. that when “ passages in “ the Grecian poets are cited, or al- “ luded to, in the writings of the New” or Old “ Testament,” the same “ are “ not to be considered as prophecies.” For indeed they cannot otherwise be esteemed than as “ *a mere accommoda-
tion of phrases.*”

But, when the *word of the Lord by his prophets*, or (as St. Matthew warily expresses himself) “ that which was “ *spoken*

(1) Dr. GREGORY SHARPE. — See his second argument in Defence of Christianity, taken from the ancient prophecies, page 349.

The sentence, which immediately follows the above extract, ought by no means to be omitted when the author’s sentiments on this head are quoted, viz.

“ But, indeed, to an attentive mind, the difference “ will appear very great between the citations from “ prophane authors and the prophets.”

“*spoken of the Lord by the prophet,*” is cited by an evangelist, and declared to be fulfilled, the idea of “*a mere accommodation*” becomes highly improper, not only in a grammatical, but also in a religious, sense.

Therefore, in answer to all that has been said in favour of *accommodations*, I must observe, that the *fulfilling* of proverbs and phrases, or of quotations from poets and historians, by a *similarity of circumstances*, is so widely different from the *fulfilling of a prophecy*, that the true meaning of the word *fulfil*, when applied to the latter, cannot justly be ascertained by such a comparison.

The word of a *prophet* (especially the word of the LORD by a PROPHEΤ) implies a *foretelling* or promise of future things, which must in due time be *fulfilled*; as “*all things must be fulfilled*”
(said

(said our Lord) “ which were written
 “ in the law of Moses, and in the pro-
 “ phets, and in the Psalms, concern-
 “ ing me.” Luke xxiv. 44.

Therefore, when we are told, that
 “ *the word which was spoken of the Lord*
 “ *by the prophet*” is fulfilled, we can-
 not, either with grammatical or reli-
 gious propriety, (as I have before ob-
 served,) understand any other *fulfilling or*
accomplishment than that which was o-
 riginally intended by the Holy Spirit to
 be prefigured.

Because we cannot allow, that a scrip-
 ture prophecy is *accommodated* “ *to a*
 “ *particular sense, to which it originally*
 “ *had no reference,*” (2) unless we allow
 likewise, that such an *accommodation* is
 absolutely a *perversion* of the *primary*
 sense of the prophet: for readers would

PART V. D d not

(2) See page 40. Crit. Dissert.

not only be thereby perplexed and misled with respect to the true accomplishment, originally and singly intended by the words of the prophet so cited, but would also be naturally led to conceive, that the matters, related by the evangelist, were intentionally prefigured or foretold thereby, which would be a deception of no small discredit to the evangelist, if his comparison had really no other relation to the prophecy than that “ of a *similarity of circumstances.*”

So that such a misapplication of scripture prophecy cannot otherwise be considered than as a deception leading to a *double misconstruction*, as above ; which would be as little suitable to the testimony of an evangelist, “ *by way of illustration,*” as to the original sense of the prophet ; whatever Dr. Benson may think of it, or Dr. W——ms either. See his Remarks, p. 40.

If

If all this be duly considered, I think no one can reasonably suppose that an evangelist would attempt to *mislead* his readers, by declaring a prophecy to be accomplished *or fulfilled* in “a particular sense to which it *originally had no reference.*” See Critical Differt. p. 40.

Dr. Benson, in page xxii. of his introduction, informs us, that “if the iid and xvith Psalms can be shewn quite throughout to agree to king David, then they ought to be interpreted of him. But if (as some judicious persons have thought) there be in them some expressions, which are not applicable to king David, then they should be interpreted wholly concerning the Messiah; to whom they do, in every part, very well agree.”

Now I am of the same opinion with Dr. Benson, that these two Psalms are undoubtedly to be interpreted of the Messiah, and I do not at all contend for the application of them to David.

I only object, therefore, to the Doctor's rule of the interpretation, which he has applied to the said Psalms; because I think it will be liable, in a great variety of applications, to mislead and perplex those persons who may happen to adopt it.

For instance; the lxxiid Psalm, of which he speaks in the same page, is undoubtedly a prophecy of Christ's kingdom, as Dr. Benson interprets it; yet his rule seems to lead him into a real difficulty concerning it; because he is thereby obliged to deny the least reference to king Solomon; when it plainly

plainly appears by the title of the Psalm, (לשלמה “*To Solomon*,”) that the psalmist absolutely addressed himself *to Solomon*, who in the beginning of his reign was manifestly a type of the spiritual Solomon or Shiloh, (שלמה or שלה) the prince of “*peace*.” (3)

Indeed, the Doctor's rule can by no means be admitted, if we consider the nature and general style of prophetic writings, and the abrupt transitions frequently found therein; of which I have given ample and undeniable proofs from the viith, viiith, and ixth, chapters of Isaiah. See the second part of my Remarks on the Critical Dissertation.

These passages, and many others of the same kind, very much confirm what I have written (Part II. p. 104) concerning the passage quoted by St. Matthew

(3) שר שלום Isaiah ix.

threw from Hosea ; (viz. “ *out of Egypt*
“ *have I called my son ;*”) and, I think,
must prove, to all considerate people, that
Dr. Sykes (the other champion for ac-
commodations, to whom Dr. W——ms
has referred me) has been much too pre-
cipitate in declaring (pages 230 and 231
of his *Connexion of natural and revealed*
Religion) “ that the prophet (in this
text) “ is not speaking of *any future*
“ *event :*” and that the term “ *fulfilled,*
“ *cannot imply a prophecy of our Saviour’s*
“ *going into Egypt or coming from*
“ *thence,*” &c. The same observation
may with justice be made concerning
Dr. W——ms, who boldly asks, (p. 40.)
“ How can it be said, that any thing
“ is fulfilled which was not spoken
“ to be fulfilled?” as in chap. ii. 15.
(Matthew ;) “ or not spoken by a pro-
“ phet in the sense in which it is cited
“ by an evangelist?” Also the Doctor
declares, in page 39, concerning this
passage,

passage, that it “ *could not be fulfilled* ” when the *child Jesus* came out of “ *Egypt.* ”

In answer to these assertions I must observe in the first place, that they cannot by any means be proved. And, secondly, that it is most reasonable to believe this text of Hosea to be a prophecy of Christ; because the style and construction of the sentence itself is so peculiarly adapted to the *single person* of the Messiah, that the Seventy have thought themselves obliged to leave the *literal sense* of the original, in order to render it more suitable, in their translation, to *the people* of Israel: all which I have before particularly noted.

But there are still other reasons to be given in favour of it.

Though the people of Israel are here spoken of in such a manner, that Dr.

W——ms

W——ms thinks he has sufficient reason to intitle it “ *a declaration of an event long past* ;” yet St. Matthew expressly quotes it as a prophecy, viz. “ *that which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet* ;” which expression could not with any propriety be used, if the words of the prophet were merely an *historical relation* ; for they could not, in that case, be said to be “ *spoken of the Lord* .”

Thus it plainly appears, that there is not the least room to suppose *an accommodation* .

So that, notwithstanding all that has been said by Dr. Sykes, Dr. George Benson, and Dr. W——ms, against double senses, it must unavoidably be allowed, that the “ *declaration (in this place) of an event long past*” prefigured *an event to come* ; and consequently that *this single text* affords an indisputable
proof

proof of the subsistence of double senses in the Scriptures.

Though some Christians have run into errors by turning every thing into allegory, double senses, parables, and types, whether they were really so or not, yet this is no just argument why we should indiscriminately reject all constructions of this kind.

And, though I contend for double senses in some cases, yet I am as averse to an unnecessary multiplication of them as Dr. W——ms can be; and therefore reject and protest against the Doctor's proposition, (in his MS Reply to my Remarks,) that if a prophecy "*has two (senses) it may have two hundred; and all of them equally just.*"

The *fulfilling of a prophecy* (as I have before observed) must mean the *only*

PART V.

E e

true

true accomplishment or completion of it ; so that it cannot justly be extended or applied to any farther circumstances than those particularly and originally intended ; therefore, when an evangelist has declared a prophecy *to be fulfilled*, though he may have convinced us that the prophet's words referred to are capable of bearing *a double sense*, (viz. one literal, and one allegorical, or prefigurative, which he himself points out,) yet, at the same time, he manifestly excludes the other one hundred and ninety-eight senses, notwithstanding that Dr. W——ms thinks “ *all of them* “ *equally just.*” For, after a declaration is made (*of indisputable authority*) that a prophecy *is fulfilled*, it would be, not only impertinent, but presumptuous, to look for *a farther accomplishment.*

It is necessary, however, for me to observe, that the *fulfilling of some particular*

ticular prophecies includes a considerable length of time as well as a variety of circumstances and places.

Of this I propose to give one remarkable instance, which will afford me, at the same time, a proper opportunity of speaking more particularly to Dr. Sykes.

The Doctor, in his *Connexion of natural and revealed Religion*, chap. x. p. 229, affirms, “ that our Saviour and
 “ his apostles applied the term *to fulfil*,
 “ when there was only a similitude of
 “ circumstances : and (that) they cited
 “ the words of the Old Testament, and
 “ made use of that term upon the ap-
 “ plication of them, where they did
 “ not design to express the *accomplish-*
 “ *ment* of a *prophecy*.” “ You have”
 (says the Doctor) “ *an instance very clear*
 “ in Matthew xiii. 14, 15. where our
 “ Saviour gives the reason why he spoke

“ to the people in parables: *because,*
 “ says he, *they seeing, see not; and*
 “ *hearing, they hear not, neither do they*
 “ *understand.* And in them is fulfilled
 “ *the prophecy of Esaias, which saith,*
 “ *by hearing ye shall hear, and shall not*
 “ *understand; and seeing ye shall see,*
 “ *and shall not perceive.* For this peo-
 “ *ples heart is waxed gross, and their*
 “ *ears are dull of hearing, and their*
 “ *eyes they have closed; lest at any*
 “ *time they should see with their eyes,*
 “ *and hear with their ears, and should*
 “ *understand with their hearts, and should*
 “ *be converted, and I should heal them.”*

“ Our Saviour” (says the Doctor) “ ap-
 “ plies these words to the Jews in
 “ Judea, and St. Paul, many years af-
 “ terwards, applies the very same pro-
 “ phesy to the Jews at Rome.” “ This
 “ shews” (continues he) “ that, though
 “ the term *fulfil*, when applied to an
 “ *event*

“ *event foretold*, does signify the ac-
 “ complishment of a *real prophecy*: yet
 “ it was used in cases where there was
 “ no accomplishment of a prediction,
 “ but only a *similitude of circumstances*;
 “ and, consequently, the application of
 “ the words of a prophet to a certain
 “ particular event, by which they are
 “ said to *be fulfilled*, does not certainly
 “ imply either a double sense of prophe-
 “ cy or that such a *particular event* was
 “ foretold:” “ But the real meaning
 “ of the word must be determined by
 “ other circumstances; such as, whe-
 “ ther the prophet is speaking of a fu-
 “ ture event or not, or, in short, by
 “ those means by which one knows
 “ whether the words are prophetic or
 “ not.”

But, before all this reasoning of Dr.
 Sykes be admitted, we ought carefully
 to

to examine the foundation or proof on which it is built.

This he calls “ *an instance very clear* ;” but I hope to convince my readers that it is *no instance at all of this matter*, and consequently that the Doctor’s conclusion thereupon is unjust.

Were not the Jews one people, and descended from the same stock, whether they lived at Jerusalem or Rome?

If this be granted, (and I think the most zealous advocates for Dr. Sykes will not deny it,) it must necessarily be allowed, likewise, that this remarkable prophecy of Esaias concerning them (viz. “ by hearing, ye shall hear, and “ shall not understand,” &c. Isaiah vi. 10.) was *manifestly fulfilled* when the Jews rejected the doctrine of Christ, whether preached by himself at one
time,

time, or by his apostles at other different times.

So I think I may safely conclude that the two *different applications*, quoted by Dr. Sykes of this same prophecy, were not occasioned, as he supposes, by a mere “*similitude of circumstances*,” but by a *direct accomplishment of the prediction in both cases*.

Now, as this example cannot any longer serve the cause in favour of which it was quoted by Dr. Sykes; I hope it will not be esteemed an improper example of a very *different argument*, and therefore I beg leave to claim it, on my side of the question, as “*an instance very clear*” of the truth of the observation which I made above, viz. that the *fulfilling* of some particular prophecies includes a considerable length of time as well as a variety of circumstances and places.

However,

However, I must not leave this text without coming to a farther explanation with Dr. W——ms concerning it, because he has brought a very heavy accusation against me concerning the parallel account given by St. Mark, chap. iv. 11, 12.

He charges me with *reflecting* “*se-*
 “*verely on the character of the blessed*
 “*Jesus,*” by saying, “that he taught
 “in parables, lest they should under-
 “stand and be saved.” “Our Savi-
 “our” (says the Doctor) “gave a very
 “different reason for his conduct; and
 “Mr. S—— should have rendered the
 “passage, Mark iv. 12. agreeable to the
 “evangelist’s words in the 33d verse of
 “the same chapter: *μηποτε* should be
 “there translated *if peradventure*, as it is
 “in 2 Timothy ii. 25.” However, I am
 not at all conscious (I thank God) of
 having

having in the least respect offended against the character of our blessed Lord.

Neither do I know of any *severe reflection* in this case; except the Doctor's *own charge against myself*.

Whatever sense the word *μηποτε* may bear in other places, yet, in the parallel places of St. Matthew and Mark above-mentioned, it must necessarily be construed "*lest*;" or to that effect: for, as the sense of the context must confirm the true meaning of any particular word, it will be found, upon examination, that the Doctor's sense of these passages cannot possibly be admitted.

The words of Christ, according to the testimony of both these evangelists, point out the material distinction which he then made between those that were true believers and the reprobate Jews,

whom our Lord called “ them that
 “ are without,” (see Mark iv. 11.) to
 the former it was “ *given to know the my-*
stery of the kingdom of God,” Matthew
 xiii. 11. Mark iv. 11. but to the latter,
 says St. Matthew, “ *it is not given.*”

Now this necessary distinction is en-
 tirely lost by Dr. W——ms’s interpreta-
 tion, because there is no such distinction
 made in the 33d verse of the fourth
 chapter of St. Mark, the sense of which
 the Doctor proposes to adopt; for the
 evangelist is there speaking of Christ’s
 preaching in general to the whole mul-
 titude, including those to whom “ it
 “ was given to know,” as well as those
 to whom it was “ not given;” and this
 is certain, because in the very next verse
 (the 34th) we read, that afterwards,
 “ *when they were alone, he expounded*
 “ *all things to his disciples.*”

Now

Now it might very well be said of Christ's preaching to the whole multitude of good and bad together, that "with many such parables spake he the word unto them, as they *were able to bear it*;" because Christ observed this same method even when he taught his disciples alone; and at last declared to them, soon before his passion, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye *cannot bear them now*." John xvi. 12.

But, when the *reprobate* Jews are spoken of *separately and distinctly* from those to *whom* it was "*given to know*," it cannot be understood that the word was spoken "unto them as they *were able to bear it*."

Because, it is apparent that they *were never able to bear it or bear it*; ac-

cording to the true sense of these phrases ;
 which imply such a comprehension of
 the doctrine, as may produce an assent,
 or belief ; otherwise the prophecy of
 Isaiah, which Christ then referred to,
 could not have been fulfilled. “ Be-
 “ cause *seeing, they see not ;*” (said our
 Lord ;) “ and hearing, *they hear not,*
 “ neither do *they understand.*” (Which
 is very different from being spoken to,
 as Dr. W——ms would have it, “ as
 “ *they were able to hear.*”) “ And in
 “ them” (continued our Lord) “ is ful-
 “ filled the prophecy of Esaias, which
 “ saith, by hearing, ye shall hear, and
 “ *shall not understand ;* and seeing, ye
 “ shall see, and *shall not perceive.*”
 (Therefore it is plain that St. Mark’s
 expression, chap. iv. 33. cannot be ap-
 plied to these, when distinctly spoken of
 from the rest of the congregation.) “ For
 “ this people’s heart” (said Isaiah) “ is
 “ waxed gross, and their ears are dull
 “ of

“ of hearing, and their eyes *they have*
 “ *closed, lest* at any time they should see
 “ with their eyes, and hear with their
 “ ears, and should understand with their
 “ heart, and should be converted, and
 “ I should heal them” (said our Lord.)

The closing of their eyes was their own act and deed, “ *their eyes* THEY *have closed,*
 “ *LEST they should see,*” &c. So that there was no partiality (4) in their condemnation, they having rendered themselves unworthy of a clearer revelation by their unwillingness to be converted.

They

(4) For “ the reason why these mysteries are no
 “ more plainly deliverèd unto them, (the Jews,) is
 “ for their foregoing obstinacy.” See ASSEMBLY’S
 ANNOT. on the said text.

Dr. Hammond paraphrases the 15th verse to the same effect, viz. that “ this is a just judgement of
 “ God’s upon them, for their obduration and obsti-
 “ nacy,” &c.

Monf. Martin likewise explains this to the same purpose. “ C’est à dire, que Dieu se cache à ceux
 “ qui, l’ayant pu trouver, ne se sont pas mis en état
 “ de le chercher, et qu’il livre à leurs préjugés et à
 “ leur ténèbres ceux qui ont fermé les yeux à la
 “ vérité.”

They rejected such evidence as Christ was pleased to give them; which would have been amply sufficient, had they *not wilfully shut their eyes against it*; for St. John says, chap. iii. 19. “ this is the condemnation, that light is come into the
 “ world, and men loved darkness rather
 “ than light, because their works were
 “ evil.”

Therefore they were *justly esteemed unworthy* “ to know the mysteries of the
 “ kingdom of heaven.” For, “ who-
 “ soever hath,” (said our Lord,) “ to
 “ him shall be given, and he shall have
 “ more abundance: but whosoever *hath*
 “ *not*, from him *shall be taken away even*
 “ *that he hath*. THEREFORE, *διὰ τὸ*,
 “ speak I to them in parables, because
 “ they, seeing, see not,” &c.

The words *διὰ τὸ*, “ THEREFORE,” plainly refer to the foregoing sentence,
 viz.

viz. “ but whosoever *hath not*, from
 “ him *shall be taken away*,” &c. So
 that the scope and tenor of the argu-
 ment would be entirely destroyed if Dr.
 W——ms’s sense of the parallel passage
 in St. Mark were to be admitted. For
 Christ plainly intended to shew, that
 the unbelieving Jews would lose even
 what little knowledge they had ; so far
 would they be from understanding or
 receiving his parables. And the event
 plainly proved this ; for they fell from
 bad to worse, until the total destruction
 of Jerusalem, when *the abomination of*
desolation (spoken of by Daniel) was ac-
 complished.

St. Mark does not, indeed, express
 the very words of the prophet Isaiah, nor
 mention the quotation made of them by
 Christ, but he plainly delivers the *full*
sense of them, as they were really *fulfilled*
 in the unbelieving Jews, viz.

“ Unto

“ Unto you” (said Christ to his disciples) “ it is given to know the mystery
 “ of the kingdom of God, but, unto
 “ *them that are without*, all these things
 “ are done in parables: THAT, seeing,
 “ they may see, *and not perceive*; and
 “ hearing, they may hear, and *not un-*
 “ *derstand*, LEST at any time they should
 “ be converted, and their sins should
 “ be forgiven them.”

The particle *να* (“ THAT”) followed by verbs in the subjunctive mood (*βλεπωσι και μη ιδωσι, &c.*) cannot possibly be made sense of, if the word *μηποτε* (“ LEST”) is translated “ *if peradventure*;” because the negative *μη* (viz. *μη ιδωσι, and μη συνιωσι*, “ *may not see, and may not understand*”) absolutely leads to a different sense from that proposed by Dr. W —ms.

So

So that it is most reasonable to conclude, with Dr. Hammond, that these words, *ἵνα βλέποντες* “*that seeing,*” &c. “note the obduration of the Israelites, which fell on them from God’s desertion, as a punishment for their not making use of the talents which he had given them; and so this verse is answerable and parallel to Matthew xiii. 15. or the end of that place in Isaiah, recited and set down at large in St. Matthew; but here (and so also in Luke viii. 10. and John xii. 40.) epitomized and summed up, *μηποῦε ἰδῶσι,* *lest they should see,*” &c.

The word *μηποῦε*, therefore, cannot in either of these places be construed “*if peradventure,*” without destroying the propriety of our Lord’s quotation from Isaiah, delivered at length by St. Matthew, and epitomized by St. Mark

as above ; for the word $\mu\eta$, in the original prophecy, is properly rendered $\mu\eta$ in the Syriac, and LEST in the English translations, and cannot possibly bear any other sense agreeable to the context, because the prophet plainly foretold that the Jews would wilfully shut their eyes ($\mu\eta\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon$) “ LEST they should see with “ their eyes.”

Now, men do not usually shut their eyes in order to see therewith, or (according to Dr. W——ms’s interpretation of $\mu\eta\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon$) “ if peradventure” they may see with their eyes ; but, rather, that they may not see, or, according to the propriety of the English translation of $\mu\eta\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon$, “ LEST they should see with “ their eyes,” &c.

The closing of the eyes, in this place, is indeed a mere figurative expression for the insensibility and wicked obstinacy of
of

of the Jews; yet the same reasoning holds good, notwithstanding this consideration, and sufficiently proves that the word *μηποτε* must be construed *negatively*, and not, as Dr. W——ms proposes, “if *peradventure*.”

By this example we learn that some parables were not only difficult to those reprobate unbelievers, whom St. Mark calls “*them that are without*,” but also even to the true disciples themselves; who, by misunderstanding the parable of the sower, and by desiring an explanation of it, (see 10th verse,) occasioned this remarkable answer of our Lord, the purport of which is recorded in the two texts considered above.

Nevertheless, there were very many cases, wherein the teaching by parables and types was (not only the safest and most prudent but also) the shortest and

clearest method of conveying a true idea of the proposed doctrine, as being very suitable to the genius and customs of the Eastern nations in general, and of the Jews in particular; and also because the types and figures themselves would make a very deep impression on the memory, and by their well-known characters clearly illustrate the allegorical meaning.

I propose now to reconsider the principal subject of my Remarks, viz. the prophecy of Isaiah concerning the birth of Immanuel.

Dr. W——ms has asserted (page 44.)
 “ that the evangelist only alludes to the
 “ passage in Isaiah, because it was *re-*
 “ *markably suitable* to the matter which
 “ he was relating.”

This occasioned my question to the Doctor, viz. “ If עֵלְמָה does not signify
 “ a

“ a virgin, in what sense can the text
 “ be esteemed *remarkably suitable* to the
 “ miraculous conception of a virgin by
 “ the Holy Ghost? And in what man-
 “ ner, could the *accommodation* of it
 “ to that singular event assist the sacred
 “ historian” (as he supposes) “ *by way*
 “ *of illustration?*” See Part I. page 63.

I afterwards observe, that the Doctor
 “ has taken great pains to make the
 “ text *remarkably unsuitable*, by infinua-
 “ ting that הַעַלְמָה the YOUNG WOMAN”
 (as he construes it) “ spoken of in the
 “ text was so far from being a virgin,
 “ that she was *with child*, even at the
 “ time when she was pointed at” (as he
 devises in p. 31.) “ by the prophet.”

To which the Doctor replies, “ had
 “ St. Matthew alluded to the birth of
 “ this child, it would have been *very*
 “ *unsuitable.*”

Now

Now this concession is sufficient for my purpose, because the Doctor's insinuation, that the evangelist alluded only "*to the name Immanuel,*" and not to the other circumstances related by the prophet, must appear entirely groundless, when we consider the words of St. Matthew.

For, though the evangelist interpreted the name *Immanuel*, yet this does not prove that he referred merely to *this name*, but, rather, that no other person but the Messiah himself could properly be intitled "*God with us ;*" and consequently that he esteemed the words of Isaiah to be really a prophecy, and such an one as could not be *fulfilled*, except in Christ alone, who was truly "*God with us.*" But farther,—The evangelist's manner of introducing the quotation very clearly shews that *this name*

was

was not the only thing he intended to allude to.

For he says, — “ NOW ALL THIS
 “ WAS DONE (τετο δε όλον γεγονεν) that
 “ it might *be fulfilled* which was spoken
 “ *of the Lord by the prophet*, behold A
 “ VIRGIN *shall be with child*, and shall
 “ *bring forth a son*,” &c.

The words “ ALL THIS WAS DONE ” must refer to the relation, before given, concerning the miraculous conception of *the virgin Mary* by the Holy Ghost, and therefore the prophecy of Isaiah, that A VIRGIN should *conceive*, and bear a son, was *suitable*, not in the name only, (as Doctor W——ms has insinuated,) but in the whole quotation.

Another objection is made, “ that
 “ the birth of a child from a virgin is a
 “ fact of such a nature, as not to admit
 “ of

“ of proof.” “ It is a fact” (says the Doctor) “ which in the *very nature of* “ *it cannot be a sign to any person but* “ the mother.”

Nevertheless, the Scriptures inform us that this *sign* was clearly proved (i. e. the wonderful event that *a virgin had conceived* was known with absolute certainty) even *before* the birth of the Messiah; and this, not merely by the testimony *of the mother*, but by other very sufficient authorities; which rendered the sign as apparent and indubitable as any other sign that was ever given, even the most self-evident.

For, after the angel Gabriel had revealed to the virgin Mary, that she (although a virgin) should “ conceive “ and bring forth a son;” St. Luke i. 31. the same thing was confirmed to her by her cousin Elizabeth, in the hill country of Judea.

“ Blessed

“ Blessed is she that believed,” (said Elizabeth, filled with the Holy Ghost,) “ for there shall be a performance of those things which were told her from the Lord.” Luke i. 45.

See the whole salutation, and the testimony of John the Baptist, though himself at that time was only a babe in the womb; which clearly proves that the absolute knowledge of the fact was not confined to the *virgin-mother alone*.

Afterwards an angel was sent from God to prevent Joseph from putting away his espoused wife on account of her being with child; and the angel informed him, before the time, that she should “ bring forth a son;” and, that he might the more effectually convince him of his wife’s purity and virtue, he assured him, saying, “ *that which is*

PART V.

H h

“ con-

" conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost."

Matt. i. 20.

Therefore, though " the birth of a child from a virgin" is by Dr. W——ms esteemed " a fact of such a nature as not to admit of proof," yet nothing is impossible with God, who was pleased to give these indubitable proofs of the long-promised sign even while the child Jesus was in the womb, which must entirely obviate the Doctor's objection, that "*this cannot be a sign to any person but the mother.*"

In the fulness of time the sign was manifested in the most extraordinary manner.

An angel, accompanied with a multitude of the heavenly host, proclaimed the wonderful birth to the shepherds in the field; and a star pointed out to
the

the eastern strangers the place where the young child lay.

Undoubtedly, this wonderful circumstance, that A VIRGIN HAD BROUGHT FORTH A SON, would, in a little time, be as well known to *the house of David* as these miraculous manifestations and confirmations of the said supernatural birth; especially as the family of Joseph, the blessed virgin's husband, was *the chief branch of that royal stock*, lineally descended from Zorababel, and so from the son of Jesse.

There is still another difficulty with Dr. W——ms. “I cannot perceive” (says he) “*what event* the birth of “Immanuel could be a sign of, unless it “*could be a sign of itself.*”

But is it really possible that Dr. W——ms “cannot perceive” that the

miraculous birth of the true Immanuel was a sign of something more than that event itself?

Was it not a sign to all those, who then waited for “ *the consolation and redemption of Israel,*” (Luke ii. 25.) that *the kingdom of God was nigh at hand?* (Matthew xii. 28. (5) Luke x. 9, 11.) (6).

Was it not a sign to *Joseph, and others of the house of David*, that a child, so born, must be the long-promised Messiah of the *seed of David*, to whom *the kingdom was to be restored*, and in whom (according to Isaiah’s promise to his cotemporaries of *the house of David*) it

(5) “ But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, “ then *the kingdom of God is come* unto you.”

(6) “ And say unto them, the kingdom of God *is come* nigh unto you.—Notwithstanding, be ye sure “ of this, that the kingdom of God is come nigh “ unto you.”

it was to be established for ever? See
Isaiah ix. 6, 7. 2 Sam. vii. 16.

But, I find, it is in vain that I urge
to Dr. W——ms the accomplishment
of the several prophecies concerning the
establishment of the “ *kingdom of Da-
vid*” in Christ; for the Doctor still seems
to persist in his former notion that Na-
thaniel “ *laboured under a mistake*” in
calling Christ “ *king of Israel*.”

He hopes to evade the point, by al-
ledging, that “ not only Nathaniel and
“ the disciples, but the whole Jewish
“ nation, did actually labour under a
“ great mistake about *the nature* of the
“ Messiah’s kingdom.”

Thus he would lead me to a very dif-
ferent question; but I am aware that,
though the disciples did, for some time,
“ *labour under a mistake*,” as the Doc-
tor

tor observes, concerning “ *the nature of the Messiah’s kingdom,*” yet there was *not the least mistake*, in those who truly believed, concerning the main point in question, viz. whether or not the Messiah *was really a king.*

Notwithstanding that our Lord rejected all the temporal authority of a worldly king, and declared that his kingdom was not of this world, he was nevertheless really a king, “ *king of Israel,*” (as Nathaniel called him,) and king of Judah, or (which is the same thing) “ *king of the Jews;*” for even Pilate himself seemed convinced of Christ’s just right to the title of *king*, though, like a thorough-paced time-server, he preferred his own temporal interest to all other considerations, and delivered up THE KING OF KINGS (Rev. xvii. 14.) to be slain, knowing him to be A KING; for, his answer to
the

the chief priests, concerning the title intended to be affixed to the cross, plainly shews that he was conscious of this.

Dr. W——ms charges me with having
 “ brought a vast number of texts to
 “ prove, not (my) assertion, that Jesus
 “ was ever called the king of Judah,
 “ but the truth of (his) assertion,” &c.
 concerning the mistake of Nathaniel.
 And he says, “ this will be evident to
 “ every one who consults the passages
 “ cited by me.”

But, if the Doctor will please once more to consult the passages himself, he will find that several among them are prophecies which were absolutely fulfilled in our Lord Jesus.

Therefore, I hope, he will not venture to assert that the prophets likewise
 “ *laboured under a mistake*” when they
 proclaimed

proclaimed these titles of the glorious Messiah; or that the disciples, and all other Christians even to this day, still “labour *under a mistake*” in applying them to Christ, in whom alone they were or could be fulfilled.

“ Rejoice greatly, O daughter of
 “ Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusa-
 “ lem: behold THY KING *cometh un-*
 “ *to thee:*” the prophet then proceeds
 to describe *this coming of THE KING*
of Zion and Jerusalem, so as exactly to
 correspond with the evangelist’s account
 (Luke xix. 37, 38.) of Christ’s public en-
 try into Jerusalem, when “ the whole
 “ multitude of the disciples began to re-
 “ joice and praise God with a loud voice
 “ for all the *mighty works* that they had
 “ seen: saying, *blessed be THE KING*
 “ *that cometh in the name of the Lord,*”
 &c. For he was certainly a *king* even
 when he rode upon the ass, which is
 proved

proved by the continuation of Zechariah's prophecy, (ix. 9.) whereby he points out the character and appearance of *the king of Zion and Jerusalem*, mentioned in the beginning of the same verse; "he is just," (said the prophet,) "and having salvation, lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt, the foal of an ass."

So the prophet Micah declared, that out of *Bethlehem Ephratah* should "he come forth that is to be ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." (Chap. v. 2.)

The event proved the truth of the prophet's words, as well as of the evangelist's citation, (Matt. ii. 5 and 6.) for the holy one that was born at *Bethlehem*, was afterwards undoubtely "ruler in Israel," before the dissolution of that

PART V. I i people

people from an united nation : of which (besides the power of his teaching and his mighty works) his public entry into Jerusalem, and the authority shewn by him in clearing the temple, are remarkable proofs.

That Christ was “ a ruler in Israel ” is implied in the preceding words of the same prophet, (Micah v. 1.) “ they shall smite the judge of Israel with a rod upon the cheek.” A ruler and a judge are synonymous terms ; and it is certain that Christ pronounced judgement against *Israel* for their impenitence and want of faith ; condemning them (with respect to their *temporal estate*) to a horrid destruction and desolation : (7) and all this was most punctually fulfilled (8) upon them ; it is certain, likewise, that the same “ judge of Israel,” whom they smote

(7) St. Matthew, chap. xxiv.

(8) See Josephus's account of the Jewish War.

smote upon the cheek, will *one day judge them*, also, in their *eternal state*, as well as all their unhappy descendants who persist in the same belief.

If these prophecies were really *fulfilled* in Jesus, they most certainly prove that the Messiah was (as he ever will be) A KING, and consequently that his disciples were not mistaken in calling him so, howsoever they might misunderstand the *nature* of his kingdom.

Therefore the Doctor's reply upon this point cannot be well esteemed a proof of any thing more than of his own great unwillingness to acknowledge that he himself (instead of Nathaniel) *labours under a mistake*.

Another remarkable excuse which the Doctor has offered in behalf of his hypothesis, deserves particular notice.

In answer to my Remarks on Canticles vi. 8. (concerning the particular distinction there made of virgins from queens and concubines,) the Doctor replies, that “ *Hebrew poetry is not so well understood* as to enable (me) to determine that עלמה in Canticles vi. 8. is not used instead of בחולה *for the sake of metre.*”

This unexpected turn of thought may, perhaps, be esteemed ingenious, but it is far from satisfactory; for, if critics were allowed to substitute the sense of one word for another, whenever their arguments are reduced to that necessity, it would be but a vain task to dispute with them; and a confusion of language, like that of the builders of Babel, must necessarily succeed their perversion of words.

In

In English poetry the Doctor may produce as many instances of such substitutions as he pleases, and he may rest assured that I shall never think it worth my while to attempt a confutation of them.

But, when such refined criticisms are applied to any part of Holy Scripture, I think they ought not by any means to be admitted, unless the authors of them shall be able to prove that it is more justifiable to adapt the Scriptures to our own private opinions, than our opinions to the Scriptures.

The END *of* PART V.

I N D E X

O F

Texts referred to in the foregoing Work;

O F T H E

Various Topics discussed;

A N D O F T H E

Different Authors referred to.

I N D E X

O F

Texts referred to in the foregoing Work.

GENESIS.

Chap.	Verses.	Pages.
iii.	15.	55.
xxiv.	43.	17. 21 n.
xxv.	30.	148 n.
xxx.	28 to 30.	111.
xlix.	8.	155.
	10.	142. 145.
		174. 179.

EXODUS.

ii.	8.	17. 21 n.
x.	20.	18.
xxii.	16.	12. 14.

LEVITICUS.

xxiv.	33.	134.
-------	-----	------

NUMBERS.

xxi.	8, 9.	53 n.
xxiii.	24.	157.
xxvi.	59.	18.

DEUTERONOMY.

Chap.	Verses.	Pages.
xviii.	15. 18.	179.
xxii.	21.	18.
	23, 24.	16.
	28.	15.
xxiii.	7.	148 n.
xxviii.	61. 62.	134.

JUDGES.

xiii.	5.	119.
xvi.	17.	183 n.

1 SAMUEL.

xvii.	32 to 51.	157.
xviii.	5. 14, 15.	157.

2 SAMUEL.

vii.	13, 14.	91.
	16.	56. 245.

2 KINGS.

2 KINGS.

xvi.	6.	25.
xvii.	6.	128.
	16.	98 n.
	18.	136.

1 CHRONICLES.

xxii.	9.	91.
-------	----	-----

2 CHRONICLES.

xxviii.	23, 24.	30.
xxix.		30 n.
	24.	30.
xxx.	1. 11. 18.	31.
xxxiv.	9.	135.
xxxv.	3.	138.

EZRA.

ii.	62.	140 n.
iv.	2.	129.
	3.	139 n.
	2. 10.	130.

ESTHER.

ii.	2.	30 n.
-----	----	-------

PSALMS.

ii.		211.
xvi.		211.
xxxvii.	19.	88 n.
xl.	6, 7.	174.
lx.	7.	176.
lxxiii.	25.	16.
lxxii.		92. 212.
cxviii.	8.	176.
cxviii.	22.	99.
cxxvii.	5.	88 n.
cxxviii.	3.	114.

PSALMS *continued.*

cxliv.	12.	114.
--------	-----	------

PROVERBS.

xxviii.	1.	157.
xxx.	19.	11. 21 n.
	20.	13 n.
	30.	157.

CANTICLES.

i.	3.	18. 21 n.
vi.	8.	13. 19 n.
		21 n. 252.

ISAIAH.

iv.	2.	114.
vi.	10.	222.
	9, 10.	228.
vii.		75, 76.
		80. 213.
vii.	5, 6.	55.
	4, 7.	58.
	8.	33. 127.
		128. 131.
		153. 158.
	13.	57.
	13 to 16.	7. 22. 201.
	14.	21 n. 35.
		80.
	14 to 16.	47. 81.
	16.	21 to 47.
		105 n.
		137 n.
viii.		127. 128.
		131.
	4.	52.
	3, 4.	52.
	4, 6, 7, 8.	76. 77.
	8.	31.

ISAIAH

ISAIAH *continued.*

viii.	14.	31.
	13 to 16.	77. 86.
		87.
ix.		75. 77.
		80. 89.
		213.
	1, 2.	79.
	6.	80. 91.
	7.	59.
	6, 7.	244.
	6, 7, 9.	
	10, 11, 21.	77 n.
xi.	1.	116.
	4.	107 n.
xxviii.	10, 13.	81.
	16.	87. 99.
xxxiii.	22.	175.
xl.	27.	138 n.
xli.	8, 14.	138 n.
xlii.	6, 7.	108 n.
xliii.		138 n.
	8, 9.	197.
xlix.	1 to 4.	100 to
		111.
	3.	106.
	4 to 7.	107 to
		111.
liii.		84.
	2.	114.
	3, 4.	190 n.

JEREMIAH.

xxiii.	5.	114.
	5, 6.	85 n.
xxx.	9.	85 n.
xxx.	22.	55.
	31.	140 n.
xxxiii.	15.	118.
	10.	85 n.

JEREMIAH *continued.*

l.	1, 4, 8, } 140 n.
	9, 10. }

LAMENTATIONS.

iv.	7.	119.
-----	----	------

EZEKIEL.

iii.	4, 11.	139.
	4.	139 n.
xxxiv.	23, 24.	42.
xxxvii.	19, 22.	141.
	24.	42.
xliv.	22.	15. 19.

DANIEL.

ix.	26, 27.	178 n.
		179.
xii.	11.	177 n.

HOSEA.

xi.	1.	100. 110.
		214. 215.
	2.	104.
	5.	33.

AMOS.

iii.	8.	157.
viii.	2, 3.	133.
	10.	132. 133.
ix.	4.	131.

MICAH.

v.	1.	250.
	2.	45. 113 n.
		171 n. 249.
	8.	157.

HAGGAI.

HAGGAI.

ii.	92.
3.	93.
6, 7.	94.
7.	83. 93.
9.	93.

ZECHARIAH.

iii.	8.	114.
iv.	6 to 10.	94.
vi.	11 to 15.	95. 96 n.
	12.	95 n. 115.
viii.		140.
ix.	5.	32.
	9.	44.
x.	11.	33. 158.
xi.	1.	178 n.
xii.	1.	139.

MALACHI.

i.	1.	139.
iii.	1.	180.
iv.	5.	177.

TOBIT.

i.	17, 18. 21.	132.
ii.	2, 3. 6.	132.

MATTHEW.

i.	18 to 23.	60.
	20.	242.
	20, 21.	107 n.
	22.	207.
	22, 23.	60.
ii.	1, 2.	41.
	2.	171. 173.
	4 to 6.	171 n.
	5.	113 n. 181.

MATTHEW *continued.*

ii.	5, 6.	249.
	15.	100.
	15. 23.	100.
	20.	39.
	22, 23.	116 n.
	23.	112.
iii.	5.	181.
xi.	12, 13.	185.
	14.	180.
xii.	28.	244.
xiii.	11.	226.
	11, 12, }	230.
	13.	
	13, 15.	229 n.
	14, 15.	219.
	15.	233.
xv.	24.	43.
xvi.	28.	120.
xvii.	10 to 13.	180 n.
xix.	8.	15.
xxi.	8.	43.
xxxiii.	2.	176.
xxiv.		121. 168.
	15, 21.	177.
	24.	194.
xxvii.	42.	46 n.

MARK.

i.	24.	114 n.
iv.	10 to 13.	82 n.
	11, 12, }	82.
	13.	
	33.	224. 226.
		228.
	34.	226.
x.	47.	113 n.
xi.	15, 16.	45.
xiii.		122. 168.
	19.	178 n.

MARK

MARK *continued.*

xiv. 67. 114 n.
xvi. 6. 114 n.

LUKE.

i. 5. 154. 182.
15. 183.
17. 180.
31. 107 n.
240.
32. 41.
34. 54.
39. 183.
65. 183.
45. 241.
ii. 10, 11. 47 n.
25. 108 n.
244.
32. 108 n.
40, 52. 117.
iii. 10. 181.
iv. 16. 117.
34. 114 n.
viii. 10. 233.
x. 9, 11. 244.
xvi. 16. 185.
xviii. 37. 113 n.
xix. 37, 38. 248.
38 to 48. 44.
xx. 17, 18. 99.
xxi. 122. 168.
8. 194.
20 to 24. 178.
xxiii. 6, 7. 162.
xxiv. 19. 113 n.
44. 209.

JOHN.

i. 1. 46 n.

JOHN *continued.*

i. 10, 11. 83.
45, 46. 80 n.
49. 48.
ii. 15. 45.
18 to 22. 99.
iii. 14, 15. 54.
30. 185.
iv. 1, 2, 3. 186 n.
v. 22, 23. 85 n.
31. 187.
31 to 39. 188. 189.
45, 46. } 189.
47. }
vi. 1, 2, 14. } 191. 192.
15. }
15. 42.
vii. 42. 113 n.
52. 80 n.
ix. 50. 184.
xi. 47 to 51. 184 n.
xii. 13. 43. 48.
40. 233.
xvi. 12. 227.
xviii. 5. 113 n.
36. 42.
xix. 14, 15. 169.
19. 113 n.
xxi. 22. 120.

ACTS.

iv. 11. 99.
12. 98 n.
x. 36. 47 n.
xii. 23. 166.
xxiv. 5. 116 n.
xxviii. 25, 26, }
27. } 220.

ROMANS.

ROMANS.

ix. 32, 33. 87 n.
33. 87.

1 CORINTHIANS.

i. 23. 88.
ii. 7, 8. 47 n.
iii. 11. 99.

2 CORINTHIANS.

vi. 16. 97 n.

EPHESIANS.

ii. 20, 21, } 99.
22.

PHILIPPIANS.

ii. 10. 156.
11. 47 n.

2 THESSALONIANS.

ii. 11. 194.

1 TIMOTHY.

ii. 5. 98 n.
iv. 1. 97 n.

2 TIMOTHY.

ii. 25. 224.

HEBREWS.

i. 2. 41.
5. 92.

1 PETER.

ii. 8. 88.

REVELATION.

v. 5. 156.
xvii. 3. 99 n.
14. 96 n.
xviii. 4. 97 n.

INDEX

I N D E X

O F T H E

Various Topics discussed in this Work.

A.

ALEXANDRIAN MS. See *Septuagint*.

B.

Barchocheba, or *Barchozba*, an impostor, 196.

Benson, (Dr. Geo.) remarks on his Preface to vol. I. of his Paraphrase, &c. 202 & seq.

Bill of Divorce, the seducer of a virgin not privileged to give one by the Jewish law, 15. See *Seducer*.

C.

Christ. Proved to have been king of Judah and Israel, 41. 246. a stone of stumbling to the Jews, 83 & seq. his divinity to be clearly proved from the Old Testament, 85 n. Jehovah Sabaoth, a title of his, 86; why called a Nazarene, and the propriety of that appellation, 113 & seq. two prophecies of his explained, 120; not a Nazarite as Dr. W——ms supposes him to be, 183 n. See *Nazarite*. Faith in him almost universally submitted to at different times, 193; distinction made by him relating to the Jews, 226.

Church of Rome. Improperly called the Catholic Church, 96 n.

Complutensian

Complutensian MS. See *Septuagint*.

Critical Reviewers. See *W—ms* and *Trinitarian Controversy reviewed*.

D.

David. The promise, that his throne should be established for ever, fulfilled in Christ, 56 & seq.

Double Meanings. See *Scriptures* and *Prophecies*.

E.

Edomites or *Idumæans.* Accounted Jews from the conquest of them by John Hyrcanus, 147.

Ethnarch. That officer inferior in dignity to a king, 160.

G.

Galilee. Pointed out by Isaiah as the place where Immanuel was chiefly to be manifested, 79.

Gentiles. Were not induced to acknowledge the truth of the Scriptures, by becoming converts to Judaism, but to Christ, 110.

H.

Herod the Great. Had a right to be esteemed a Jew, 146; endeavoured to be proved really so by Mr. Mann, 146 n. never omitted an opportunity of claiming that title, 151; which Josephus does not deny, 152.

Herod Agrippa. See *Shikb.* Slew St. James, and persecuted the Christians, 166; his dreadful end, 166; Judæa was never a kingdom after his death, 167.

Hyrcanus (John.) See *Edomites*.

Herod Antipas, tetrach of Galilee. The person who beheaded John the Baptist, 161; Judæa not a kingdom in his time, 163.

I.

Jerusalem. Destruction of that city a type of the last day, and a pledge of the certainty of it, 122.

Jews. Remain a distant and peculiar people in the midst of all nations, 58; did not consider that the humility

humility of the Messiah was foretold by the prophets, 83; which they could not reconcile with their ideas of their expected king, 84; this name became common to all the tribes about the reign of Josiah, 136; and likewise Israel, 127; lost the distinction of their tribes after the Babylonish captivity, 141; petition Cæsar to change their government, 159. 169; folly of their still expecting the Messiah, 171 n. their extreme credulity in the time of Josephus, 195; and since, 196; reprobate Jews not worthy to know the mysteries of the kingdom of Heaven, 230.

Joshua. See *Solomon*.

John (St. the Baptist). The prophet promised by Malachi by the name of Elijah, 180; a lawgiver, 181; and a Jew, 182. See *Lawgiver* and *Prophet*.

Immanuel. Dr. W——ms's assertion, that Isaiah's prophecy concerning him had no reference to the Messiah, examined and confuted, 22 & seq. that prophecy construed to relate to the Messiah 279 years before the birth of Christ, 67; which is confirmed by all the ancient MSS. of the Septuagint, 68. See *Galilee*. That prophecy considered, 236.

Isaiah. The birth of his son, Maher-shalal-hash-baz, a proof that his father's prophecy concerning Immanuel related to our Saviour, 51; and a pledge of that prophecy's being fulfilled, 54; that prophecy (though so strong and clear,) delivered above 700 years before the birth of Christ, 84 n.

Judea. See *Herod Antipas* and *Herod Agrippa*.

J. K.

Kennicott's (Dr.) expedient of supposing a corruption in the Hebrew text, unnecessary, 12.

L.

Lawgivers. The Sanhedrim, or Scribes and Pharisees, not to be accounted such, 175; St. John the Baptist the last among the Jews, 183.

M.

Mark (St.) defended, 224 & seq.

Matthew (St.) His application of the prophecy concerning Immanuel defended; 60; chap. ii. 15. reconciled with Hosea xi. 1. 100 & seq. his application of a prophecy, ii. 23. defended, 112.

Messiah. Called Israel by Isaiah, 106.

N.

Nathaniel. Defended, 39 & seq.

Nazarene. Christ so called from the city of Nazareth, 113, 119.

Nazarite. John the Baptist strictly so, according to the Jewish law, 113, 119; Christ improperly called so by Dr. W——ms. 183 n.

P.

Parables. Some difficult to the disciples themselves, 235; teaching by them defended, 235.

Popish prayer-book. Served as a passport at the massacre of Paris; 99 n.

Prophecies. Frequently attended with difficulties, 50; those in the 7th, 8th, and 9th, chapters of Isaiah, seem to have been delivered during the invasion of Rezin, king of Syria, and Pekah, king of Israel, 75 & seq. quick and abrupt transitions not unusual in them, 81; often blended with different subjects, 90; and often bear a double construction, 90; perfect tense as frequently used in them as the future, 105 n. the question, Whether allegorical expressions or double senses are to be allowed in them? discussed, 202 & seq.

Prophet. None sent from God since John the Baptist, 184; the meaning of the word explained, 208.

R.

Reasons for writing these Remarks, 1. See W——ms.

S.

S.

- Sabbatei Sevi.* An impostor, 196.
- Scriptures.* We ought to ask God's assistance that we may understand them comfortably, 82 ; double senses in them proved, 201.
- Seducer* of a virgin obliged to marry her, by the Jewish law, and not allowed to give her a bill of divorce, 15 ; if of an espoused one, to suffer death, 16.
- Septuagint.* See *Immanuel*. All the translations of it, where the Hebrew word, translated *virgin* in our Bibles, is rendered a *young woman*, were made after the birth of Christ, 69.
- S*— (Mr.) an assertion of his defended, 224.
- Shiloh.* The prophecy, that the sceptre should not depart, &c. fulfilled, 141, 154 ; Herod Agrippa being appointed king by Claudius, no objection to that prophecy, 163 ; the other part of that prophecy explained, 174.
- Solomon, Zerubbabel, and Joshua,* types of the Messiah, 96.
- Sykes* (the late Dr.) censured, 214 ; an objection of his answered, 219.

T.

- Trinitarian Controversy reviewed.* The Critical Reviewers mistaken in their recommendatory criticism of that work, 86 n.

V.

- Vatican MS.* See *Septuagint*.
- Venetian MS.* See *Septuagint*.
- Virgin* bearing a son, a sign worthy the birth of Christ, 10 ; the Hebrew word so translated occurs only seven times, 11, 19 ; the text where the meaning is most doubtful, 11 ; the common English translation of that text defended, 12 ; also of Gen. xxiv. 43. and Exod. ii. 8. 17. and Psalm lxviii. 25. 18. Cant. i. 3. 18. the Rabbins always understand it to mean a virgin, 70.

W.

W——ms (Dr.) his Critical Dissertation on Isaiah, wherein he asserts the Hebrew word translated *virgin* seems to mean a *young woman*, either a virgin or not, the occasion of these remarks, 7; approved by the Critical Reviewers, 8; the authors of which have copied almost all his Dissertation, 3; has set forth his hypothesis to the best advantage, but not proved his assertion, 9. See *Virgin*. Told the author of another writer who agreed with his opinion, but did not know it when he published his Dissertation, 10 n. See *Immanuel*. No difficulties in the prophecies so great as those occasioned by the Doctor's translation, 50; forgets a former assertion of his, 63; his own mistake causes the difficulty he speaks of, 89; mistaking in supposing the prophecy of Isaiah vii. 8. was of an event near at hand, 127 & seq. his assertion, that if a prophecy has two senses it may have two hundred, confuted, 217; an ingenious, but unsatisfactory criticism of his, 252.

Y.

Young Woman. See *Virgin*.

Z.

Zerubbabel. See *Solomon*.

INDEX

I N D E X

O F T H E

Different Authors referred to.

A.

ASSEMBLY'S ANNOTATIONS, 156. 229.
 Assembly's Confession of Faith examined, 10 n.
 Aquila, 28. 69.

B.

Barchocheba, 196.
 Barchozba, 196.
 Benson, (Dr. George,) 202 & seq. 210 & seq. 216.
 Bohun, 172 n.
 Brabantinus, (Nicholas,) 130.
 Bragge, (Mr.) 45.
 Bythner, 65.

C.

Cove, (Dr.) 121.
 Collins, (Mr.) 122.
 Concordance to the Greek Testament, 9 n.
 Cranmer, (archbishop,) 99 n.
 Critical Dissertation on Isaiah vii. 13, &c. 8. 21.
 209 n.
 Critical Reviewers, 8. 21. 40. 85 n. 86 n. 112. 118.
 123.
 Cruden, (Mr.) 54 n.

D.

D.

Dio Cassius, 147 n.
Doddridge, (Dr.) 62.

E.

Erasmus, 101.
Eusebius, 67.

H.

Hammond, (Dr.) 114. 229 n. 233.
Hooper, (bishop,) 99 n.
Huetius, (P. D.) 76.

I.

Jerome, (St.) 45.
Josephus, 147. 148. 150. 152. 159, 160, 161. 163 n.
164, 165. 167, 168. 170. 181, 182. 188. 195.
250 n.
Julian the apostate, 101.
Junius, (Fr.) 130.
Justin Martyr, 56.

K.

Kennicott, (Dr.) 12. 28. 29.

L.

Latimer, (bishop,) 99 n.

M.

Mann, (Mr.) 23. 146 n. 192.
Martin, (monfieur,) 157. 174, 175. 229 n.

N.

Newton, (bishop,) 58 n. 128 n. 155 n.
Nicholas of Damascus, 152.

O.

Origen, 51. 67.

P.

P.

Philo, 15.
Polyglot, (London,) 64.

R.

Ridley, (bishop,) 99 n.
Rufinus, 150.

S.

Septuagint, 28. 68. 70 n. 87. 95. 101. 102. 105.
——— Vatican, Alexandrian, Complutensian, Venetian, MSS. 68.
S——, (Mr.) 224.
Sharpe, (Dr. Gregory,) 27 n. 59 n. 65 n. 81 n. 84 n.
172 n. 207 n.
Simfon, (Dr.) 130.
Solomon's Song, new translation, 21 n.
Storkius, 21 n.
Sully, 99 n.
Sykes, (Dr.) 203. 219 & seq.
Symmachus, 28. 69.
Syriac version, 11. 28. 69.

T.

Theodotion, 28. 69.
Trinitarian Controversy reviewed, 86 n.

U.

Universal History, 34, 35. 182 n.
Usserius, (J.) 116 n.
Vulgate Latin, 11.

W.

Walton, (bishop,) 69.
W——ms, (Dr.) 8, 9, 10. 19. 20. 22, 23. 25. 33, 34.
39. 42. 48. 50. 52. 60. 61. 65. 67 n. 68. 71. 81. 88.
100. 112. 118. 122. 127. 183. 201. 202. 207.
210. 214. 215 & seq. 224. 226. 228. 231, 232.
234 & seq. 242, 243. 245. 247.

T H E E N D.

1. The first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the

By the same AUTHOR.

- I. **A** Short Treatise on the English Tongue. Being an Attempt to render the Reading and Pronunciation of the same more easy to Foreigners. 1767.
- II. A Representation of the Injustice and dangerous Tendency of Toleration Slavery; or of admitting the least Claim of Private Property in the Persons of Men in *England*. Being in Answer to an Opinion given in the Year 1729, by the (then) Attorney General and Solicitor General concerning the Case of Slaves in *Great-Britain*. 1769.
- III. Remarks concerning the Encroachments on the River Thames near *Durham-Yard*. 1771.
- IV. Remarks on the Opinions of some of the most celebrated Writers on CROWN LAW, respecting the due Distinction between *Manſlaughter* and *Murder*. 1773.
- V. In two Parts. 1. A Declaration of the People's *Natural Right* to a Share in the Legislature; which is the fundamental Principle of *the British Constitution of State*. 2. A Declaration or Defence of the *the same Doctrine*, when applied *particularly to THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND*. 1774.
- VI. The Law of Retribution; or a serious Warning to *Great-Britain* and her Colonies, founded on unquestionable Examples of God's temporal Vengeance against Tyrants, Slave-holders, and Oppressors. The Examples are selected from Predictions, in the Old-Testament, of *national Judgements*, which (being compared with their actual Accomplishment) demonstrate "the sure Word of Prophecy," as well as the immediate Interposition of divine Providence, to recompence impenitent *Nations* according to their Works. 1776.

Printed for B. WHITE, at HORACE'S-HEAD,
FLEET-STREET.

M m

TRACTS

TRACTS by the same AUTHOR.

Now in the Press for Publication, by B. WHITE, in Fleet-Street, and E. and C. DILLY, in the Poultry.

- I. **A** Tract on the Law of Nature, and Principles of Action in Man.
- II. THE CASE OF SAUL; being an Appendage to the former Tract, wherein the compound Nature and various Principles of Action in MAN (with the Reality of supernatural spiritual Influence, both good and bad) are proved by unquestionable Examples from the History of that unfortunate Monarch, and also from many other Parts of Scripture.
- III. The just Limitation of Slavery in the Laws of God, compared with the unbounded Claims of the African Traders and British American Slave-holders. With a copious APPENDIX, containing, — An Answer to the Rev. Mr. Thompson's Tract in Favour of the African Slave-Trade. Letters concerning the lineal Descent of the Negroes from the Sons of HAM. The Spanish Regulations for the gradual Enfranchisement of Slaves. A Proposal on the same Principles for the gradual Enfranchisement of Slaves in America. Reports of Determinations in the several COURTS OF LAW against Slavery, &c.
- IV. The Law of passive Obedience; or, Christian Submission to personal Injuries. Wherein is shewn that the several Texts of Scripture which command the entire Submission of Servants or Slaves to their Masters, cannot authorize the latter to exact an involuntary Servitude, nor in the least Degree justify the unbounded Claims of modern Slave-holders.
- V. "The Law of Liberty;" or (as it is called in Scripture by way of Eminence) "the Royal Law," by which all Mankind will certainly be judged!









